

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches* Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)

VOL. III.

April, 1939.

No. 6

CONCERNING THE EIRENIC METHOD¹

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Here and in succeeding issues we give a translation of Dom Lialine's article that appeared in *Irénikon* in 1938 with the kind permission of its editor.

IN our last issue we published in full a criticism of *Irénikon* by V. Zenkovskij; and we promised an article which would comment on points of general interest raised by his criticism and also give a better estimate of our work.² The following pages aim at fulfilling that promise. We must begin by summarising the chief points of V. Zenkovskij's criticism:

Irénikon is a Catholic review dealing with the possibilities of the reunion of Orthodoxy, especially Russian Orthodoxy, with the Catholic Church, and the relations between them. It differs from other similar Catholic reviews because: (1) it is quite free from their usual wrong attitude (the "uniate" attitude) towards the Orthodox; (2) it has a thorough understanding of Orthodoxy and imparts this understanding to its readers; (3) it admits the possibility of Catholic life being enriched by the theological and liturgical wealth of Orthodoxy. In this last point lies its true position as regards reunion. In spite of these qualities, *Irénikon* shares with all other Catholics a lack of understanding as regards the position of Orthodoxy in the Œcumenical Movement, because, on account of a "stony insensibility," it does not appreciate any more than they do the essence of Protestantism and its message, and therefore, apart from the conscientious study of Orthodoxy, it brings nothing real to bear upon reunion between Catholics and Orthodox. In short, *Irénikon* has a fine

¹ The term is used throughout in the technical sense defined by the author. (Trs.)

² An official review of the position was last made in 1934, pp. 353-357. I shall have occasion to quote copiously from articles which appeared before that date.

method of studying, understanding and making known things Orthodox (excepting always those which have reference to the Œcumenical Movement), and also, has elements of a general method of approach to reunion, which is sometimes successful.

In my opinion the controlling idea of *Irénikon* has been and is the reverse of what V. Zenkovskij finds in it. It has always considered the reunion of the Orthodox Church, especially of the Russian Church, with the Catholic Church as a particular case of applying a general method of reunion.

I shall give here, over my own name, and provisionally, first of all some reflections on this general method, and then an explanation of the advantages that its application to Orthodoxy may have for reunion; the explanation will also deal with the omissions indicated by V. Zenkovskij.

I.

The general method of reunion adopted by *Irénikon* is the eirenic method. "Eirenicism is an attitude of mind, not a doctrine," as Arnold Rademacher so well expresses it.¹ A definition is always unsatisfactory in matters of psychology, but the following seems to be the best: "Eirenicism is the conciliatory attitude of a man who seeks the truth, towards another or other men whom, rightly, he believes to be animated by the same dispositions as himself." This wide and intellectual outlook² eliminates all narrow and sentimental imitations—too frequently found in the sphere of reunion, the result of an unenlightened charity that we shall have occasion to consider later—and offers a wide field of application. I shall begin by sketching schematically its general features; next, consider this schema in its still general but now more practical applications, and lastly, draw certain conclusions. Eirenicism and the universal outlook go together: "The eirenic attitude prevails when the confessional problem *in general* is under discussion."³

The following is a schema, or more accurately, a "dialectic." It is incomplete no doubt; and its different parts are in reality not entirely separable. It supposes two workers for reunion, of different faiths, one of which is taken hypothetically to be true; and it studies their method of approach.

First stage: Inadequate knowledge and understanding. The one has gained from the religious instruction of his youth

¹ *Die Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Kirchen*, Bonn, 1937, p. 38.

² Which does not in the least prejudice the character of this intellectuality which is not now under consideration.

³ K. Frör, *Evangelisches Denken und Katholizismus*. Munich, 1931, p. 8.

an elementary knowledge of his faith and of that of the other. From this knowledge he judges that his companion subscribes to a false faith which, for trivial reasons, denies what is true and affirms what is false. As he is eirenic, a seeker after truth, he will not rest content with this first judgment, because he will doubt the accuracy of his knowledge. He will try to improve his knowledge by tapping the sources of his own faith and that of his companion.

Second stage: New knowledge and understanding. The new knowledge which he gains in this way will teach him more about his own faith and about his companion's; he will see that all the latter's affirmations or denials are not so absolute as he thought, and that often they are only minimizations or exaggerations of truths. He will learn to understand better the latter's reasons for denying, affirming, minimizing and exaggerating. He will also learn his companion's estimate of his own faith, which will be very similar to the estimate he himself had made in the first stage.

Third stage: Examination of conscience. By analyzing his companion's judgment on himself, he will see its inaccuracy, whether it be due to lack of knowledge or to the fact that he himself has expounded his own faith incorrectly, incompletely, or with faulty emphasis on this or that truth—two things which in point of fact go together. He will congratulate himself on not having stopped at the first stage, and will wish to continue his investigations.

Fourth stage: Criterion of judgment and presentation of faith. Continuing his examination of conscience, the first worker for reunion will try to learn more of his faith so that he may the better explain it for the benefit of the other. The resulting statement will make each truth of his faith fall into its proper place in relation to the whole, and be the better grasped in consequence.

Fifth stage: Conciliation or disagreement. The worker for reunion will now be better able to judge the faith of the second, since he has more knowledge and understanding of it, and a better criterion by which to judge. Having gone over these stages several times, if necessary, he will be able to reconcile the two faiths on some points but will find total disagreement on others, which he should always make plain to his companion.

The second worker for reunion, if he is eirenic, will do the same in regard to the faith of the first as the first has done to his. The result of this exchange of opinions

will be a mutual grasp of their respective faiths ; and this will enable them to assess with a greater degree of truth the points of agreement and humanly irreducible disagreement.

To summarize :

(1) the eirenic method aims at eliminating *apparent* points of disagreement in different faiths, and at bringing out points of *real* disagreement, by :—

I. A change for the better on both sides

- (a) *in knowledge* derived from fundamentals ;
- (b) *in understanding* of the other's position (the difficulties of others are not minimized, explained away) ;
- (c) *in the criterion of judgment* as regards agreement or disagreement ;
- (d) *in the presentation* of beliefs.

II. Agreement or the explanation of irreducible disagreement.

In other words, the eirenic method does not spy out weaknesses in other faiths, but first searches for and makes clear, as Father Pribilla, S.J., aptly expresses it, the *ontology* of beliefs, in order to discover by a sure diagnosis the real *pathology* of those which are defective.

(2) The eirenic method is a scientific method which rigorously (by knowledge, criterion) searches out what is true (agreement, disagreement) and is therefore free of the characteristics of *apologetic*, which is "sometimes disinclined, in its eagerness to prove the truth, to face facts; it last resorts to special pleading or to a kind of camouflage; or on the other hand makes such exaggerated claims and over-statements as to cause uneasiness to sincere and simple minds."¹

(3) The eirenic method is not all-powerful; nor is it naively optimistic, for it recognises its limitations: once the real and humanly irreducible disagreements between faiths are reached, only a supernatural agency can enable two workers for reunion to come to agreement.

(4) The eirenic method is slow, subtle and exacting.

(5) It is to the eirenic method that all conscious or unconscious workers for reunion aspire. "What our separated brethren ask of us is a generous effort to state and elucidate doctrine in such a way as to eliminate misunderstanding and evasion; an effort to secure the whole truth for the many souls who, like ourselves, yearn for the unity of Christendom."²

¹ M.-J. Congar, *Divided Christendom*. Geoffrey Bles. 1939, p. 263.

² D. L. Beauvuin, in *Irénikon*, 3 (1927), 449.

(6) In view of all these definitions, the eirenic method is not the dreadful caricature which Nietzsche made of it, for whom breadth of sympathy is "one third indifference, one third curiosity, one third unhealthy emotionalism; and for whom objectivity means lack of personality, of will, and incapacity for love."¹

And what aptitude does the method thus schematically defined require of the eirenic worker for reunion? They will be set forth in detail later; let it suffice to say here that a good intention is not all that is needed, and that in addition there must be complete confidence in the strength of pure truth—the eirenist is not an "apologist"; there must be patience, and, above all, the spirit of discernment and justice. "Exactitude is neither truth nor reality. Exactitude is ἀκριβεία. It is the perfection of discernment." And "the instrument of justice is not enthusiasm; it is not even exaltation; it is proportion, that quality of proportion which comes only of being completely sure of oneself."²

The schema here set out may seem to savour of algebraic dialectic. But such an impression would be mistaken, for the methodological stages which it indicates demand for their effective working something other than the mathematical mind.

The first limitation which our aim imposes on us even in this general part is that we must consider the application of the eirenic method to Christian communities only, one of them being hypothetically in possession of the true faith as having all the divine and human elements which were and are given it by Christ. At the outset therefore we take our stand in the domain of *Christian interconfessionalism* where, as V. Zenkovskij expresses it, faiths differ by reason of their conceptions of the Church, a domain which Mgr. Ehrhard has therefore called the domain of *kirchlich* and *antikirchlich*.³ This domain, at least in what concerns the relations between Catholicism and Protestantism on the continent, was that of the Counter-Reformation,⁴ the polemic

¹ *Wille zur Macht*, No. 79.

² Péguy, *Pensées* (NFR), p. 51; and Charles Dubos, *Extraits d'un journal*.

³ Cfr. *Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert*, 1902, p. 500; the different stages in the secularisation of the European races since the sixteenth century are shown. *Antikirchlich* (loss of faith in the Church), *antichristlich* (loss of faith in Christianity—revealed religion), *antireligiös* (loss of faith in natural religion, in this case Theism). This could, being a "démise du point," illustrate the eirenic method from a negative point of view. Let us also add that the term *antikirchlich* will never be used in this article in the sense of one hundred per cent *anti*.

⁴ Oskar Bauhofer, corroborating Mgr. Ehrhard, puts the end of the Counter-Reformation at the *Aufklärung*, when Catholicism and Protestantism ceased their opposition on the ground of *kirchlich* or *antikirchlich* to fight more or less consciously side by side against the philosophy of Enlightenment (*antichristlich*). Cfr. O. Bauhofer, *Einheit im Glauben*. Zurich, 1935, p. 160.

method of which—a necessity no doubt when it is a question of defending the truth rather than of explaining it or of seeking it elsewhere—generally errs on one of the essential points (or on all at once) of the eirenic method.¹ What we are doing therefore, we do the more willingly in that the explanation of our method will gain thereby in clearness and character.

Further limitations :

(a) I shall purposely omit all that, in the domain we are considering, is not strictly speaking doctrine—human weakness, social evils, etc. For I do not think it is to this type of “scandal” that Zenkovskij’s “stony insensibility” on the part of Catholics refers. Moreover, the eirenic approach finds no difficulty there; and disagreements can never reveal themselves as irreducible in it. I would call the application of the eirenic method to difficulties of this sort an *irenique primitive*.²

(b) In order to avoid creating difficulties which are not strictly religious, I shall leave on one side in our general plan the rational, speculative and moral criteria (the principle of contradiction, proofs of the existence of God, natural law, etc.), which are the concern of philosophy and natural religion. Similarly I leave aside the religious criteria of revealed religion which are not speculative but prudential (consensus of theologians, non-infallible *magisterium*, etc.), and which concern the security rather than the truth of doctrine. Needless to say, a practising eirenicist, if he is a Catholic, will have to introduce these criteria into his method and into his studies; moreover, the examination of one of them will have to be undertaken later. Here, I shall take revealed truth, Tradition, as my only criterion of eirenic judgment.

In the sphere of ecclesiology (*kirchlich*) we shall ascend gradually, through a number of stages, from the domains (each of which ought to be studied exhaustively and to form a special part of eirenicism) in which disagreements are more easily resolved since they do not involve absolute truths (revealed by the criterion), to the domains in which these truths alone are in question, and render certain disagreements definitively irreducible. It is then that the nature of our religious criterion will appear clearly. This progressive method may appear *aprioriste*: but it is sug-

¹ The opposition of *Polemik* to *Irenik* is frequent in the Protestant theological language of reunion. As, for example, in K. Frör, *op. cit.* (a little encyclopædia on this subject).

² H. Guillemin dealt with this subject lately in a way which has not been judged very successful, in *Par notre Faute* (*La vie intellectuelle*, 51 (1937), No. 3. 326-363).

gested more by experience than by the nature of things. The domains successively covered are: (1) realities which are almost entirely human (culture, etc.); (2) religious philosophy; (3) religious social life; (4) Christian Tradition. In each of these the eirenic method sets out to clear up the confusion between apparent and real disagreements, the realm of the "problematical." Brief illustrations will be given at each stage.

A. The first sphere to be considered is that of human earthly realities (politics, culture, education, etc.). The testimony of distinguished œcumenists, as well as the doctrinal difficulties encountered in practice by the Christian (Ecumenical) Movement, demonstrate the importance of studying it. "Our minds are trained from early childhood, to approach life and its issues in quite distinct ways . . . The fixation of our minds in these varying mental patterns and methods inevitably affects our interpretation of religion . . . The more thoughtful Christians in every land may be trusted to correct their native bias of mind and to supplement too restricted accounts of religion.¹

To apply the schema :

Knowledge acquired from the best sources: philosophic anthropology, psychology and history; the judgments of others concerning oneself. *Understanding*: most important here; the danger lies in stooping at appearances instead of grasping clearly the underlying ideal. (If appearances which would need a "hermeneutic" in the manner of Dilthey are interpreted apart from the ideal or contrary to it, they can, by a kind of literalism which kills the spirit, become a caricature of the underlying reality and as such the opposite of eirenicism. *Examination of conscience*: not to make absolute the human relative. *Judgment*: irreducible disagreements will, in the last analysis, be very few; the majority of apparent disagreements will disappear because they will often prove complementary.

Let us take the example of an average Catholic and an average non-Catholic of the twentieth century. From the sixteenth century there has been a profound divergence of ideals between them. I think I may go so far as to say, without sacrifice of truth, that often what is "human" for the one is "antihuman" for the other; these terms obviously ought not to be taken in relation to the empiric nature of man but in relation to the supernatural (for the Catholic) or to

¹*The non-theological factors in the making and unmaking of Church Union.* Third report of the Fourth Commission. Edinburgh Conference, p. 26-27.

the natural ideal (for many non-Catholics).¹ In order to probe the ignorance, misunderstanding, narrowness, obscurantism on both sides—and more sometimes on the side of the Catholic than on that of the other—the eirenicist, even though he may find it more interesting and useful to concern himself with more formally theological questions, must be conversant with the relation, past and present, of Catholicism to non-Catholic culture in countries which are of more than one faith, where people of different religions can more easily form contacts with one another (Acton, Newman and others in England; Ehrhard, Muth, Rademacher and others in Germany).

B. The second degree is very like the first but is more religious in character because it concerns not man alone, but man and God, or God and man; and not only man's earthly destiny but his superterrestrial end as well. It belongs to the domain of *Christian religious philosophy*, which differs from theology in that its concern is with human aspirations in regard to those problems which are fundamental to every religion, taking little account of Revelation, or even emptying it of its content. This is the domain of the philosophy of subjective religion (P. Przywara); it is "the world of quality, that *phenomenology* of the religious soul, which is one of the things with which contemporary philosophy is most concerned."² It is a domain of the first importance

¹ This is how Amiel (although not *average*) expresses himself: "Catholic thought cannot conceive personality as conscious and master of itself. Its audacity and its weakness come from the same cause: lack of responsibility, the subjection of a conscience which knows only slavery or anarchy, which proclaims the law but does not obey it because it is outside itself Ultramontane Catholicism never frees its flock, who must admit, believe, obey, because they never attain maturity" *Journal*. Geneva, 1905, I, p. 87 and II, p. 87-88. Compare the reproach aimed at the Catholic religion for having, after the sixteenth century, arrested the development of culture (Dollinger in *The Reunion of the Churches*, London, 1872, *passim*, especially p. 141), and the reply of Anglicans to this reproach in Newman's *The Social State of Catholic Countries no Prejudice to the Sanctity of the Church*. Difficulties of Anglicans, London, I, p. 229-260.

² The philosopher who, in this matter, resumes almost all preceding and dominates almost all subsequent, positions, is evidently Nietzsche. Attempts at a Catholic estimate of the man who is more or less a follower of Nietzsche have not been very happy up to the present. Lately there have appeared R. Egenter, *Das Edle und der Christ*, Munich, 1933; D. Thalhammer, *Edelmensch und Gnade* (Zeitschr. f. kath. Theologie, 1937, No. 4, p. 483-508). Let me give another example. In order to defend his Church against reproaches of lack of appreciation of culture, a Catholic wrote recently: "The Church has given proofs enough that she is by no means the enemy of intelligence But she would give all the books in the world for one act of charity." All true Christians agree with the above on principle. But it is important to know, anthropologically, whether for this or that Catholic, the sacrifice of culture would be the most painful of all calamities, or whether it would be harder still to lose money or to miss a banquet.

³ M. Nedoncelle, *La philosophie religieuse de Friedrich von Hügel*. Paris, p. 295.

because, throughout the ages of Christianity, and especially since the sixteenth century, it has been the seat of the conflict between natural and revealed religion, subjective and objective religion (which are not at all the same thing). A. Paul wrote on the subject in connection with reunion: "It is the endless advance of every faith between two rocks, impersonal law and personal conscience; on the one hand doctrinal unity, on the other individual liberty."¹

A last argument to stress the importance of this stage: the conclusions of the fourth Commission at Edinburgh which has already been mentioned and which apply just as well to this stage as they did to the last.

To apply the schema; (henceforth I shall indicate only the specific points in each stage):

Knowledge: religious psychology and philosophy, their history. *Judgment*: conciliation on many points by complementation; irreducible disagreement however on more points than in the preceding stage as a result of the presence, to a greater degree, of absolutes.

Again it is in countries professing more than one faith that, naturally and fortunately, Catholics have felt the need to study the religious philosophy of non-Catholics as well as their own. The *Dublin Review* in England was established for the purpose of dealing with this matter and one could wish that it were more mindful of the fact. A great name, if not the greatest in this connection is—need it be mentioned?—that of Baron Friedrich von Hügel, who may frequently be taken as a model.

C. We now leave the almost entirely subjective plane to enter a plane which is more objective and still more formally religious: *the religious life of Christian societies* ruled by governmental authority.² Though a society be more or less authoritarian, its religious life will still include a more subjective and spontaneous element: the spirit of the liturgy, devotions, ascetic and mystical methods, types of sanctity, etc.

To apply the schema:

Knowledge: religious psychology—in the present case there is nothing more formative than well-planned travel; history; judgment of other communities on one's own.³

¹ *L'Unité chrétienne. Schismes et rapprochements.* Paris, 1930, p. 376.

² *Irénikon* has never considered the application of the eirenic method to individual conversions but always to that of societies.

³ The notes of the Rev. E. J. G. Forse appearing regularly in *The Church Times* are useful for encouraging healthy comparisons, but are spoilt by a dangerous atmosphere of the picturesque. They form a kind of "armchair" devotional tour of the continent, if not of the world, for amateurs.

Understanding: we shall return to this when we are dealing with Orthodoxy, which is a pitfall for Westerns in this respect. *Remedy*: to understand the ideal. *Examination of conscience*: psychological and historical relativism acquired by the study of one's own community.¹ *Presentation*: we shall see an example below. *Judgment*: conciliation on many points; a greater number of irreducible disagreements.

By the side of the speculative criterion which will be dealt with below, stands the criterion of social authority.

An example of presentation is suggested here since it is so characteristic of the eirenic method. Non-Catholics are often scandalised by modern forms of Catholic devotion to the Pope (examples of their disapproval may be found in *Irénikon* 7 (1930), 738-740, taken from the work of N. Arsejev: *Pravoslavie, protestantizm i katolicestvo*, Paris, 1930). For they think that Catholics in practising these forms of devotion are guilty of a mystical, and blasphemous, confusion between the person of the Pope and that of Christ, the latter disappearing completely behind or in the former. We shall not examine here the bearing of these reproaches as that has already been done. Let us ask here how, in face of these reproaches, we can present the doctrine of the Papacy to non-Catholics. I do not think that Father Charles, S.J., for example, tackled it successfully in his article, the intention of which is eirenic: *Vicarius Christi* (Nouv. rev. theol., 1929, No. 6, 443-459). He appeals to the argument *ex convenientia*: in this case, the form in which devotion to the Pope is expressed—precisely the thing which is misunderstood by Protestants. The argument *ex convenientia* is not appropriate therefore, and may provoke a reaction contrary to that sought by the article. "The Vicar of Christ when exercising his sovereign authority and exerting the whole extent of his disciplinary power, is not a man it is the mystic, invisible Christ Who makes Himself seen and heard" (p. 457). A non-Catholic, even though he be an eirenicist, will with difficulty trace in this phrase the *real* distinction that would be made by a Catholic, and would not be altogether wrong if he asked the author with some malice why his article was not rather called: *Christus mysticus*.

¹ Non-Catholics lay stress on the psychological differences in the Catholic Church in different epochs. "The question (of changes in Lutheranism) is reinforced by the fact that post-Reformation Catholicism was not by any means a direct continuation of pre-Reformation Catholicism, but shows also a new ecclesiastical formation, the result of Ignatian-Jesuit mysticism." G. A. Glinz, *Luther als ökumenische Grösse in Luther in ökumenischer Sicht*, Stuttgart, 1920, p. 129. F. von Hügel, very sensitive to changes of this kind, chose for his study on mysticism the pretridentine figure of St. Catherine of Genoa.

Irènikon 6 (1929), 830, in its summing up said very reasonably: "It is not therefore useless to resort again to the historic arguments of theology when dealing with this question." But let us not anticipate the explanation of eirenic theology which will be given later on. If our example is doctrinal, it is because doctrine appears in it under the aspect of devotion and propriety.

With these three stages: present-day and historic anthropology, religious philosophy and religious psychology, we leave the domain in which subjective relativism predominates and in which it is of such importance to study the religious ideal.

To induce the *unioniste* Catholic theologian to give these things a part of his contemplation I should like to quote, in addition to what I have already said, this sentence from the eminent French pastor, A.-N. Bertrand: "It might be said without paradox that what divided the Church in the sixteenth century was less a question of theology than a problem in psychology."¹

As for eirenic judgment in this domain, let me appeal in a calmly objective way to the judgment of caution used by St. Benedict in his Rule: "Unusquisque proprium habet donum ex Deo, alius sic, alius vero sic: et ideo cum aliqua scrupulositate a nobis mensura victus aliorum constituitur." (Chap. xl).

I should like to review still more briefly the second plane of the region of social religious life, in which governmental authority carries greater weight; this forces me to separate it from the first, and to link it up with the later, objective stages.

Briefly, the same phenomena as before are present but are subject to norms; instead of the liturgical spirit we have ceremonial; instead of devotions, the fixed order of liturgy; and (this concerns the domain of doctrine but is mentioned here by way of comparison), instead of ascetic-mystic ideals of holiness, the norms set by ecclesiastical teaching on this subject. Let us apply the schema:

Knowledge: ecclesiastical history and the history of canon law. *Understanding*: historical spirit, religious ideal. *Examination of conscience*: sound historical relativism. *Presentation*: historic and doctrinal changes. *Judgment*: the eirenicist may form judgments, but only the authority of the society (if it is authoritarian) is competent to ratify them.² *Criterion*: norms of human institution—variable under

¹ *Protestantisme*. Paris, 1931, p. 132. We shall see that the apparent paradox in this sentence also applies in Catholic-Orthodox relations.

² Here we meet the very important questions on Eastern uniatism, Anglican corporate reunion, Lutheran uniatism (a very good example of the phrase to which this note relates may be found in *Irènikon*, 12 (1935), 334: The Thienne Case).

the control of authority (we shall not discuss the criterion of social authority in the general schema, so diverse are the conceptions which different Christian societies have of it).¹ Norms of divine institution—the adaptation to legitimate preferences in religious and social matters.

D. The stages in the application of the eirenic schema which remain for us to examine with equal brevity, are the most important because they are strictly theological; that is to say, they are no longer concerned with the ideals and the religious life of Christian societies, but with Christian revelation handed down more or less intact (Tradition), which in its turn contains the norm (supreme because divine) of these ideals and this life. The domain of theology, therefore, will also yield us that criterion of revealed religion, chosen from other subordinate criteria in order to reach a definitive judgment concerning conciliation or irreducible disagreement.

In order to make the application of the schema more intelligible, the domain of Tradition must be subdivided according to the different channels through which, more or less authentically, it is handed down and which a theologian must explore in order to find it (theological “*loci*”).

(a) Common consent of the faithful. I place this channel here not because it is the least authentic, but because it is the least studied. I shall refrain regretfully from applying the schema to it, though I am convinced of its general importance in eirenic theology and hope to see it studied more fully by theologians.

(b) Theological tradition. The human and therefore relative rôle which (ecclesiastical) Tradition assumes, is derived from many factors, of which the chief are: the taking apart and reassembling of Tradition into a logical system of conclusions and corollaries; the scrutiny of Tradition from different points of view.

To apply the schema:

Knowledge: the history and present condition of theological systems. *Understanding*: the principles and points of view which have inspired the various theological systems; the psychological domain already dealt with will be a great help here.² *Examination of conscience*: very important here

¹ *Irenikon*, 6 (1929), 145–153. Also judicious remarks in D. A. Bolton, *Review of obstacles to union*, *ibid.*, especially p. 68 et seq.

² There is fortunately no lack of comparison between patristic and scholastic theologies of East and West. Cfr. M.-J. Congar, *La déification dans la tradition spirituelle de l'Orient*. *La vie spirituelle*, 43 (1935), No. (91)–(108). This is already a great step forward towards the *unioniste* point of view and consequently to the Catholic point of view *tout court*; but there is need of less synthetic and more detailed studies.

because of the danger of making absolute one's own theological type. The eirenic estimate of objections raised by others, by studying historic theology in one's own community.¹ *Presentation*: the consciousness of legitimate relativity in this matter. *Final judgment*: conciliation on many points by complementation.²

(c) The third channel requires by its very nature (if it is to be grasped) a certain doctrinal specification that we have tried to avoid so far. How are we to attain Tradition in its purest form, and therefore as demanding the assent of faith? In certain Christian communities authentic Tradition is more or less identified with Holy Scripture. In others, which are conscious of Tradition as such and reverence it, there is no authoritative criterion by which either theologian or ordinary layman can recognize it. This group of Christian communities (including alike Orthodoxy in its Sobornost form, Anglicanism, Old Catholicism), bears in Œcumenism the name of non-Roman Catholicism: Catholicism because it reverences Tradition; non-Roman because, among other differences, its conception of the means by which Tradition is apprehended is not that of the Roman Church. Without entering into the very complex problem of the relation between Tradition as such and its proposition to the faith of the people³ it can be said that in the Catholic Church

¹ D. A. Bolton, in his article already quoted, sketches the reaction of a Catholic theologian towards Orthodox theologies. The whole article should be read for its pertinent considerations of *unioniste* methodology, which however, do not deal with the psychological domain which the author no doubt considered "done to death" in *Irénikon*. And in a contrite examination of conscience another Catholic theologian asks: "But do we Latins through our love of clearness, simplicity and uniformity make the necessary distinctions in our teaching? Do we not infringe on rightful spiritual freedom?" Address by Rev. Fr. Dieux quoted in *Irénikon*, I (1926), 245.

² This experience, the highest in œcumenism, is greatly appreciated by Orthodox and Anglo-Catholics who love the human richness of the Church. Is not therein to be found the "theological synthesis" which the Anglican review *Œcumenica* wishes to promote? (Cfr. *Irénikon* II (1934), 549-560). In connection with this see also L. Zander's article, *L'essence du mouvement œcuménique*, in *Christianisme social*, 1937, No. 3, 262-282, and Fr. Fessard's reply in *Etudes*, 1937, July, 62-76. Let us quote Fr. Congar again: "... the multiplicity of theological traditions, within the unity of the Faith, a subject well worth discussion by itself. Once the transcendent and Catholic character of the faith is fully understood, and the manner in which theology is a human endeavour to construct and elaborate the object of faith by means of rational thought, the matter becomes quite clear in principle. *Divided Christendom*.

p. 110.

³ Professor Draguet touches upon this question when expounding the cognate problem of the development of dogma, *L'évolution des dogmes*, Apologétique (Bloud and Gay), 1937, p. 1166-1192.

the authoritative channels of this proposition are the ordinary and extraordinary *magisterium*.

To apply the schema :

Knowledge : care must be taken to search for what there may be of Tradition in the teaching of other Christian communities. Several *a priori* reasons : since they are separated from that Christian community which, on our hypothesis, possesses Tradition in its entirety they have been able to preserve some authentic parts of it, and to alter others to a greater or lesser extent¹ ; if the separated communities continue faithful to their religious spirit, traditional truths are still the sources of their life² ; the mutual reproaches of Christians for their insufficient knowledge of one another's traditional riches, and for vilifying one another in the nigardly inadequacy of polemics.³ *Understanding* : this is very important in order to grasp the motives which have preserved or altered traditional truths in other communities. All the psychological information previously acquired is a great help. *Examination of conscience and presentation* : in the domain of Tradition, separated Christians reproach one another bitterly. A Christian who is loyal to his religious community cannot accept such reproaches *a priori*. But he can and, as an eirenecist, must find out *why* other Christians blame him : viz., insufficient knowledge of Tradi-

¹ From the Catholic point of view these are the particles of gold which Pope Pius XI had in mind in his address of January 10th, 1927, quoted extensively in *Irénikon*, p. ex 8 (1931), 652, etc.

² I cannot refrain from quoting these particularly authoritative words of Oskar Bauhofer : " The recognition of the authentically and deeply religious character of the Reformation (as misinterpreted as it could be by its very character), can alone provide us with the hope that one day this character will be perfected, its meaning completed, in reunion with the Catholic Church. A great historical movement cannot live solely on an absolute negation." *Op. cit.*, p. 183-184.

³ For a Catholic, here are the warnings given by His Holiness Pope Pius XI in the address already mentioned : " Sometimes Catholics lack the right appreciation of their duty, because either knowledge or brotherly devotion is wanting." *L'Osservatore Romano*, commenting upon words of Cardinal Mercier, writes : " The Catholic Church alone keeps the whole truth ; but we cannot deny the resources of Christian vitality that certain separated Churches possess thanks to prayer, Holy Scripture, sacraments and good works. By consistently denying these Churches there is a risk of ignoring the ' share in Christ ' which is to be found in them." September 10th, 1926, quoted in *Irénikon* 7 (1930), note to p. 573. One might mention the endless reproaches levelled at Catholics on account of their lack of real knowledge of the traditional truths preserved in Protestantism, and the joy at seeing a change in this respect. " An understanding is awakening (among German Catholics) of the positive worth of the Protestant position, of what Catholicism has learnt and can learn in a vital and brotherly Christian appreciation of Protestant affirmation." R. H. Wallan, *Das ökumenische Recht des evangelischen* *Protests in Luther in ökumenischer Sicht*. 1929, p. 237.

tion, and defective presentation of it to others. On account of the different place which Tradition holds in the theology of the various Christian communities, I shall be obliged to enter into particular details. The process of examination of conscience will only be dealt with as it relates to the Roman Catholic eirenist; as far as other Christians are concerned, the examination of conscience is either too complex to be included in a schema, or else it is identical with the examination of conscience in theological tradition dealt with above.

The Catholic eirenist will endeavour in his presentation: (1) neither to alter the scope of a decision of the hierarchical (authoritative) *magisterium*, nor (2) to present traditional truth incompletely and, thereby, in a way which is exaggerated or minimized in relation to the whole (actually or as interpreted by others). In order to correct any mistake which occurs in presentation, he will have recourse either to the criterion of authority or to the speculative criterion.

(1) *The criterion of authority*: We must make an exception, mentioned elsewhere, to the criteriological principle adopted for the application of the schema. Since it is a very important matter as being particularly a cause of "scandal" to non-Catholics (it is contrary to their ideal of social and above all of ecclesiastical relations), I must quote the prudential authority of the non-infallible decisions of the Holy See. The thoughts of every Catholic eirenist will turn to L. Choupin's small but invaluable book, *Les décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège*. But if a Catholic finds in it much for his enlightenment, the Catholic eirenist finds less for his particular purpose. In connection with the decisions of Rome relating to the Bible, Professor J. Coppens recently summed up very successfully the eirenic attitude: "To act as if confronted by answers *ex cathedra*, by solutions *ne varietur*, would be to lead Catholic opinion into error and thus to raise up false difficulties for unbelievers."¹ And to raise false difficulties is the negation of the eirenic method. As for the decisions which are recognized as infallible, any accommodation of the criterion of authority can no longer apply.

¹ *L'Ancien Testament*. Objections to Catholic teaching with regard to the Old Testament drawn from pontifical and ecclesiastical rulings on the subject. *Apologétique* (Bloud and Gay), p. 1096. Is not *The Month* evincing a certain lack of discernment in writing with reference to the *Corporate Reunion* of the Anglican Church with Rome (a question on which I am not qualified to judge *in concreto*): "*Audi alteram partem* is generally a wise precaution to take when there is a question of forming an opinion about some disputed point . . . And even outside the scope of revelation, there are many questions, scientific, historical, moral, religious, which are now *choses jugées*, settled once and for all by competent authority, whether purely human or ecclesiastical." Nov. 1937, 395.

(2) *The speculative criterion.* Different contingencies must be considered. The eirenecist advances a traditional truth which has not been defined by the extraordinary *magisterium* but has been taught by the infallible ordinary *magisterium*: to set forth this teaching is one of the hardest problems of theology, which we cannot even touch upon here in spite of its importance to eirenicism.

The eirenecist presents to non-Catholics a traditional truth which has been defined by the extraordinary *magisterium*, and evokes disagreements. It might be thought that the eirenec re-statement is then no longer possible, and that one is confronted by an irreducible opposition. But on closer examination it is found to be still possible. (This possibility has been considered many times in *Irénikon*.¹ I recall it here however because it has so much eirenec value.) Defined truth may be completed because all traditional truths have not yet been defined. The purpose of the extraordinary *magisterium* is not indeed to define all traditional truths according to a theological plan, but to propound certain of them, authentically, to the belief of the faithful, as circumstances demand, it being itself the only judge of those circumstances. Moreover, even truths which have a close ontological connection with defined truth may, since for various reasons they have not been defined, remain in theological shadow and even cast that shadow over the presentation of defined truth. If it was this shadow which was the cause of non-Catholic reproach, then its dissipation might silence those reproaches. Defined truth can still be *explained* if its form seems, or is, insufficiently clear.² This complementation and development can be done either theo-

¹ It would be tedious to quote all the passages: I (1936), 173; 3 (1927) 422, 450, etc.

² This is how D. F. de Wysels expresses himself on authentic interpretation: "The aim of dogmatic definition is to place the content of Revelation within the grasp of the intelligence of the faithful authentically and as clearly as possible. The authenticity, that is to say the orthodoxy, of a dogmatic formula must always be absolute: it cannot allow of degrees: *stat in indivisibili*. Therefore it is not open to revision, that is, by way of retraction, correction or amputation. On the other hand, the clearness of a dogmatic definition can only be relative. Nothing prevents the *magisterium* of the Church from giving it new clarity by a formula which is more developed or simply more direct." (*Irénikon*, 6 (1929), 615). Just one example on the other side: Pusey believed that the dogmatic definitions of the Council of Trent could be accepted by Anglicans provided that certain of the definitions received an authentic explanation in the sense given them by moderate Catholic theologians. (Cfr. Doellinger, *The Reunion of the Churches*, London, 1872, p. 147). Professor N. O. Losskij maintains that the disagreement between Catholics and Orthodox over the "Filioque" could be overcome by a further dogmatic evolution. Cfr. *Les questions de la conscience religieuse russe* (in Russian), Berlin, 1924, p. 325, et seq.

logically (the task of the eirenic theologian), or, if judged expedient, authentically propounded by the extraordinary *magisterium* itself. Let us remember that the statement in both cases and in both ways is a contribution of new truths, and not a relativisation of absolute truth. The classic example of defective presentation of Catholic doctrine, an example which includes all the degrees of the realm of Tradition, which have been examined here, is the typical treatise *De Ecclesia*: almost always there is a lack of proportion between the constitutive elements of the Church, due to inadequate acquaintance with tradition and theology; generally speaking, it is the polemic theological tradition of anti-gallicanism and of the Counter-Reformation, and solemnly defined ecclesiastical tradition, which are chiefly, if not exclusively, investigated. This is not enough, and we have seen why. "It is certain," wrote Mgr. Carton de Wiart, "that the definition of pontifical infallibility has sometimes distracted the attention of theologians, and has caused them to minimize the doctrinal functions of bishops and apostles."¹ There are other disproportions in the treatises on the Church: between the mystic element and the institutional, etc. It is for the eirenic theologian to state and correct them in so far as he can.

We may indeed agree with V. Zenkovskij that Catholics and non-Catholics are separated less by the dogma of the Vatican than by their respective conceptions of the integral nature of the Church. Instead, however, of finding the reason for this in the very nature of things, we see it rather as a lack of theological knowledge on the part of the non-Catholic, and a defective presentation and a lack of complete knowledge of tradition on the part of the Catholic theologians.²

Judgment: on our plane of Roman Catholicism there are two kinds: (a) the authoritative judgment of the hierarchy. This I leave aside; for *quâ* judgment (though not *quâ* truth) it falls outside the competence of the eirenic theologian.

(b) Theological judgment. This judgment can and must be passed now. If all the exigencies of the eirenic method have been fulfilled, the strictly religious—because strictly traditional—criterion will have been acquired. This judgment is again of two kinds, and brings us back to the general plane: (i) the judgment of irreducible disagreement. There will be no failure to explain the theological reasons of this irreducibility: "being always ready to satisfy everyone

¹ Ephem. Theo. Lov. 1932, 728.

² *Irénikon* published in its early numbers an eirenic study on the dogma of the Vatican, by D. L. Beauduin: 3 (1927), 449-453; 5 (1928), 91-98; 231-238.

that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you" (I Peter, iii, 15). (ii) Points of view which seemed exclusive are established as complementary.¹

We can now draw some conclusions from our brief and panoramic application of the eirenic method to the general interconfessional problem.

(1) Now that we shall be better understood, let us first of all add the most important characteristic of this method to those which we have already mentioned: that of a *mise au point* which makes relative what is by nature relative, and absolute what is really absolute. It is in this that the essence of eirenicism lies. Divergences between Christians are for the most part caused in the last analysis by apparent or real *relativisations* or *absolutisations* of what in itself is absolute or relative.

(2) The criterion of eirenic judgment is, in our view, essentially traditional; indeed, it is eirenic only because traditional. Disagreements on matters of faith are always centred in the real or apparent infidelities to Tradition for which dissident Christians blame one another.

(3) To prepare oneself to judge, and actually to judge, in the light of the criterion of tradition, a reality of faith which is known and understood to the full, is to theologize, and to theologize eirenically since the aim is conciliation on points of doctrine and explanation of points of disagreement. Let us examine some of the chief characteristics of this theology:

First of all, it has the characteristics of the method which governs it: it is scientific, slow, keen and exacting.

Our practical schema makes us emphasize above all the quality which might be called "theandric," divine and human. Eirenic theology must leave no stone unturned to attain a knowledge as complete as possible, on the one hand of traditional truths wherever they may be found in the interconfessional sphere; and on the other, of the human wrappings that they assume (legitimate or illegitimate, formative or destructive) in all their complexity (psychological, philosophical, historical, social, etc.). If the proper function of theology is, as its name implies, to acquire knowledge of things divine, or of other things in relation to the divine, then the acquiring of knowledge and understanding of these human wrappings by the aid of human sciences is of capital importance: all the human branches of knowledge that eirenic theology can utilize are indispensable auxiliaries to it.

¹ An "œcumenical" example: conciliation is being sought (Lausanne) with regard to the doctrine of the ministry in the Church in the Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Congregational positions, without, however, having been reached as yet.

This theology is living, a quality which derives, not from a spurious appearance of liveliness, but from the clearest and most abundant sources of Christian truth: from Tradition.

Eirenic theology may therefore be termed essentially apostolic; not in the modern sense of imitating the kind of life led by the Apostles, but in the sense of being identified with the Apostolic Tradition that the Church has preserved since its inception, and hands on as its most sacred source of life.¹

I find at hand two descriptions which seem to fit eirenic theology accurately, one from a more scientific point of view and the other from the angle of reunion: "Priests and theologians who (like Dr. Headlam) help to restore things to their true proportions, whether by reference to historical facts or to present-day problems, render a very necessary and important service." "Does it not appear that studies undertaken (by Catholics—I add this in parenthesis in order to preserve the general meaning of the sentence. C.L.) in the spirit of a vital theology, abundantly supplied from the mainstream, in a word, essentially Catholic, a theology which, without guile but intelligently and broadly, would bring certitude to the uncertainty which is proper to our separated brethren, and answer their questions—is it not apparent that these studies would be very effective and valuable from the Œcumenical point of view? We ourselves are sure that there is something to be done in this direction: people of good will may rest assured that their trouble would not be in vain."²

Since the matter seems to justify insistence, I should like to add some remarks on what eirenic theology is not, and to make still clearer what it is. It is not a theology:

which panders to separated Catholics;³

which is badly informed on Apostolic Tradition and on human concerns;

which is worked out with the exclusive help of dogmatic formularies (e.g., Denzinger's *Enchiridion* for Catholics, and some *Confession* for Orthodox);

¹ A very good sign of eirenic dispositions in a theologian would be his having arrived at a really eirenic theology by way of a less directly *unioniste* study of Tradition; thus liturgical studies prove a very good guide towards eirenicism. Cfr. *Irénikon*, 12 (1935), note to 601.

² C. H. Turner in *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* (Catholic and Apostolic. London, 1931, p. 279) and Father Congar, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

³ Rev. Fr. Tyszkiewicz, S.J., draws attention to such a defective form of eirenic theology when writing of a book by Mgr. Grivec in which he finds it happily absent: "He (Mgr. Grivec) does not seek to please the dissidents by dangerous condescension, he does not disguise points of divergence, etc." *Orient. chr. period.* 1937, No. 3-4, 685.

which makes use of arguments *ex convenientia* ;
 which is confined to one point of view (to the initial intuition) and to one speculative policy.

The characteristics of eirenic theology (perhaps too numerous) that I have just given will make it distinguishable from a theology that is well-meant, indeed, but counterfeit because it combines all the faults enumerated above in the form of well-turned syntheses which, though apparently alive, are in reality only half alive since they lack substance ; a theology which expresses an ardent charity and an eloquent brotherliness, which longs to be *problématique* because that is the fashion, but which nevertheless proceeds forthwith to a facile solution of all problems—a solution based on principles hastily derived from “apostolic zeal” in the modern sense of the term, and shot off as though from an arsenal of speculative and traditional equipment which five or six years or so of theological study have munitioned.

DOM CLEMENT LIALINE.

(*To be continued*).

THE ARMENIAN LITURGY

II.

THE DIVINE LITURGY.

NOTE that there is no concelebration or Liturgy of the Presanctified.

The priest vests privately in the sacristy with short appropriate prayers as in the Latin rite. Meanwhile the choir sing all or some of the following nine verses :—

Sources of reference chiefly consulted :

Liturgies Eastern and Western. Brightman. Oxford. 1896.

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie. Cabrol and Leclercq. Paris.

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. Vacant. Paris. Tome I, article on “Armenie.”

The Church of Armenia. Mgr. Ormanian. English translation by M. Gregory. London. 1912.

Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. Hastings.

Dissident Armenian Prayer Book containing the Order of the Liturgy and most of the Office. Published at Constantinople. 1895.

Dissident Armenian Prayer Book containing the Order of the Liturgy and most of the Office. Published at Athens. 1924.

Denzinger Bannwart's *Enchiridion Sybolorum*. 532 sqq., 695 sqq., 3008, 3024.

Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio. Renandot.

Catholic Eastern Churches. D. Attwater. 1935.

Dissident Eastern Churches. D. Attwater. 1937.

Armenian Church. E. F. K. Fortescue. London. 1872.

Missa Armenica (Catholic). Prince Max of Saxony. Ratisbon. 1908.

"O profound mystery, incomprehensible and without beginning! Above us in the nuptial chamber Thou hast illuminated the principalities with inaccessible light, and Thou hast surrounded the choirs of angels with incomparable glory.

"Through Thine almighty and marvellous power Thou hast created Adam in the image of Thy sovereignty, and Thou hast robed him with pomp and glory in Eden, home of ineffable joy.

"Through the Passion of the Holy One, the Onlybegotten, all creatures have been reborn, and mankind is again become immortal, and hath been clothed with a garment that no one can take from him.

"O Chalice of fiery rain that wast poured on the Apostles in the holy upper room, O Holy Ghost, pour Thy Wisdom on us along with this vestment.

"Holiness becometh Thy House, Who art clothed with majesty. As Thou art about with the glory of holiness, so gird us about with Truth.

"Thou Who didst spread out Thy creating arms to the stars, strengthen our arms with power to intercede when we lift up our hands unto Thee.

"Bind our thoughts as the crown wreathes our head and may this crosswise stole, like that of Aaron, beautiful and brilliant with golden flowers, be for the honour of the sanctuary.

"Supreme Divine Sovereign of all beings, Thou hast covered us with a robe as with love, to be ministers of Thy Holy Mystery.

"Heavenly King, keep Thy Church immovable, and give peace to those who worship Thy Holy Name."

The priest (and deacon) then wash their hands reciting alternately Psalm 26 in its entirety. After a brief commemoration of Our Lady, the Confession follows with Psalm 100 subjoined. Then the priest and deacon say Psalm 42 (*Judica me Deus . . .*) as they ascend the altar steps. The curtain is drawn across and the Prothesis follows, at the incensing of which the altar is again disclosed and the congregation is incensed. The Mass proper then begins with the customary Byzantine opening of the "*Εὐλογημένα*"—"Blessed be the Kingdom of the Father and of the Son, etc." Note that not only before this but before almost every doxology or sentence uttered by the celebrant, the deacon chants: "Sir, give a blessing." The "O Onlybegotten" immediately follows, sung by the choir (this is replaced by a different introit among the Catholics); the priest prays for the people aloud and, after a short hymn,

the little entrance (of the gospel book) takes place. When singing the Trisagion, the Catholics omit the words : "Thou Who wast crucified for us," as this savours of heresy, although the Armenians have always maintained that they merely intend this invocation to be applied to the Second Person of the Trinity alone. Before the reading of one of the Apostles' epistles, there is a lection from the Old Testament, usually from the Prophets. The Gospel, read by the deacon, then follows the Alleluia, and is preceded by the singing of "God speaks" by the choir.

This is considered the close of the Mass of the Catechumens according to Brightman, and the Mass of the Faithful begins with the chanting of the Creed soon after the Gospel. The text differs slightly from that of the Nicene Creed and is in the first person plural. Moreover the following anathema is appended :—

"But those who say there was a time when the Son did not exist, or that there was a time when the Holy Ghost did not exist, or that They came into being out of nothing, or who say that the Son of God or the Holy Ghost be of a different Essence and that They be changeable or alterable, such doth the Catholic and Apostolic Holy Church anathematize."

In the Creed the Armenians also say : "We also believe in the Holy Spirit, uncreated and perfect, Who has spoken in the Law and Prophets and the Gospels, Who descended in Jordan, preached in the Apostles and lived in the Saints." The Catholics insert the "Filioque."

Then follow litanies asking the Lord for our various needs as well as worthiness to assist at the Holy Sacrifice. After a final blessing there follows the great entrance (of the Gifts of Bread and Wine which, after the Prothesis, had been set aside in a sort of niche in the wall on the north side of the altar). The deacon dismisses the catechumens. Among the Dissidents the choir now sing : "The Body of the Lord and Blood of the Saviour are set forth . . ." This has given rise to considerable controversy, but it appears to be nothing more than a dramatic anticipation of the great event. The Catholics overcome the difficulty and possibility of scandal by turning the phrase to the future tense. As they approach the altar they say alternately verses from Psalm 19 ; on reaching it, the deacon says : "Lift up your heads, O ye gates ; lift them up, O everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall enter."

The celebrant washes his hands again and the deacon says the following litany for purity of thought and right intention in assisting at what is to follow :—

“Again with faith and purity let us stand in prayer in awe before God’s holy table : not with scruple or offence, not with guile or fraud, not wiles or deceit, not with doubt or little faith : but with a right conversation, a pure mind, a single heart, a perfect faith, being filled with love, full and overflowing with all good works, let us stand in prayer before the sacred table of God and find the grace of mercy in the day of His appearing at the Second Coming of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. May He save us and have mercy.”

The priest says a doxology and “Peace ✠ with all of you.” The deacon then proclaims : “Greet each other with a holy kiss, and those of you who are unable to partake of this divine Mystery, go outside the doors and pray.” At this point the Pax is given round the congregation ; the donor says : “Christ hath appeared among us” in an audible whisper, to which the recipient replies : “Blessed is the appearance of Christ,” and so on. In some places at Eastertide, “Christ has risen from the dead”—“Blessed be the Resurrection of Christ,” is said. During this, the choir sing a hymn similar to that sung during the Mandatum of the Roman rite on Maundy Thursday, but commencing with the words : “Christ has appeared among us.” As this is before the consecration, it is suppressed among Catholics as mentioned above.

The brief verses before the preface are like those in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. The Preface usually remains the same throughout the year. The subsequent anaphora before the Consecration bears some resemblance to St. Basil’s Liturgy ; God is thanked for the various benefits the human race received under the Old Law, for the prophets, etc., “but in these last days, having utterly torn up the sentence of condemnation for all our debts, didst give us Thine Onlybegotten Son, both debtor and debt, immolation and anointed, lamb and bread of heaven, high priest and sacrifice : for He it is Who distributes and is distributed in the midst of us without being consumed.” (Cfr. the “Lauda Sion” of St. Thomas Aquinas.) “For having been made man truly and not in appearance only, and becoming incarnate by union without confusion from the Mother of God, the Holy Virgin Mary, He journeyed through life with all the passions of our human life, without sin, and of His free will came to the Cross whereby He gave life to the world and wrought salvation for us. Then taking the bread in His holy, divine, immortal, immaculate and creative Hands, He blessed, gave thanks, brake it and gave it to His chosen and holy disciples sitting at meat with Him, saying . . . ”

The deacon as usual chants : " Sir, give a blessing," whereupon the priest consecrates the bread thus : " Take eat : This is My Body Which is distributed for you and for many for the expiation and remission of sins." The choir answers " Amen," during which the priest continues secretly : " Likewise taking the cup He blessed, gave thanks, drank and gave to His chosen and holy disciples sitting at meat with Him, saying : " (Deacon : " Sir, give a blessing.") " Drink ye all of This : This is My Blood of the New Testament Which is shed for you and for many for the expiation and remission of sins." The choir answers " Amen ; Heavenly Father Who didst give Thy Son unto death for our sakes as a debtor of our debts, we beseech Thee through the shedding of His Blood, have mercy on Thy rational flock." Following the final oblation, " In all and for all we offer Thee of Thine Own," the epiklesis is said thrice in the present tense by the Dissidents, but once, and in the past tense, by the Catholics. The Third Person of the Trinity is then invoked by the choir to grant rest to the faithful departed, while the priest continues to pray in secret for all states of mankind, after which the saints are commemorated by the deacon (led by the priest himself who commemorates Our Lady, St. John the Baptist and St. Stephen). Among the commemorations " The Christian kings Abgar, Constantine, Tiridates and Theodosius " may be mentioned. To each petition the choir reply : " Remember, Lord, and have mercy." To this litany is added the commemoration of the living ; as elsewhere, Catholics naturally insert the Pope's name. Note that the deacon also prays for " the priest who offers this sacrifice." Then after a blessing we have, as in almost every other liturgy, what corresponds to the " *Supplices te rogamus* " ; the deacon prays that " the Lord our God Who has accepted (the Holy Sacrifice) on His holy, heavenly and supernatural altar, may send down on us in recompense thereof the gifts of the Holy Ghost." After another brief prayer for our Lady's intercession and for self-dedication to our Lord, the Lord's Prayer is sung by the choir, preceded by the usual short preface by the celebrant. It is interesting to notice that the sermon is usually preached just before the Lord's Prayer. The priest replies : " For Thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory for ever, Amen " ; (that is, without mention of the Blessed Trinity).

The priest prays secretly for worthiness in the reception of Holy Communion and the general sanctification of our lives with perfect contrition, while the choir slowly sing : " The Father is holy, the Son is holy, the Holy Spirit is holy," and a doxology. Then the priest, taking the Host between

the thumbs and forefingers of each hand, raises It, holds It vertically over the brim of the Chalice which he also lifts up with the rest of his hand, turns round and gives Benediction to the people, saying the while: "This is Life, Hope and Resurrection, expiation and atonement for sins"; turning back to the altar he continues: "Sing psalms unto the Lord our God, the immortal King of Heaven Who sitteth in the chariot of the cherubim." He resumes his devotional prayers privately; the Host is broken, and placing a portion in the Precious Blood, he says: "The fulness of the Holy Ghost," followed by a lengthy preparation for communion. During all this time the curtain remains drawn and the choir sing the joyful psalms and other similar verses with alleluias. The deacon at length announces to the people: "Draw near with fear and partake in holiness," and the curtain is drawn back. At this time the plate of antidoron (*blessed bread*), is passed round the congregation, but the Sacred Congregation of Rites has recommended this to be postponed until the dismissal among Catholics, as with other Oriental rites, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding or confusion as to the nature of this bread among the unlearned.

Holy communion is administered under both species by intinction, though it appears that the Catholics to-day do not exercise this privilege to which they are entitled, but receive the species of bread alone. (*D. Th. Cath., Tome I, col. 1956*). Once again benediction is given with the formula: "Save Thy people, O Lord, and bless Thine inheritance: govern them and lift them up forever." The altar is again hidden from view during the thanksgiving—aloud by the choir and in secret by the priest. The altar is displayed and the apolysis follows as in the Greek rite. The celebrant concludes: "Thou art the fulness of the law and completion of the prophets, O Christ, God Our Saviour, Who didst fulfil all the dispensation commanded of the Father: fill us also with Thy Holy Spirit."

The Last Gospel, which is probably due to Roman infiltration, follows, preceded by the usual sentences. It is read by the priest who prefaces: "From the Father of Light." According to some texts St. John i, 1 to 18, is read, instead of i, 1 to 14. At Eastertide, St. John xxi, 15 to 19, is substituted. After a further short litany of thanksgiving and a blessing, the priest usually descends from the altar holding the crucifix and/or the New Testament for the congregation to kiss.

E. EKISLER.

MELKITES AND THEIR CHURCHES IN GALILEE AND THE LEBANON

THE Melkite Church is a vital reality, for it is sufficiently numerous and of the people to be truly a native church, and not, as some of the smaller Catholic Eastern bodies tend to be, by regrettable force of circumstances, merely a side chapel, so to speak, of the Latin church. Around one in Galilee and the Lebanon are the native hill-villages of the Melkites, from archbishop to carpenter, and in those villages live the priests who share their origin and sympathy with their flocks. Their churches have the same native character, built four square to the winds by local architects, of the same stone and colour as the hills and the houses. New as well as old seem rooted in the soil.

There seems no Catholic oriental church that is wholly free from latinization as there are few dissident churches wholly free from byzantinization: there is an almost inevitable tendency to copy the larger neighbour—fifty years behind the times: nineteenth century devotions, not twentieth century liturgical revival—and also the French, who in the past have been largely in control of education, have something to account for in the influence they have exerted. With the Melkites, however, one feels that such Latinization as exists is very superficial, that fundamentally they remain what they should be, a native church upholding an oriental tradition which is of quite equal importance in the one, Christian Catholic Church with the Latin.

Such liturgical Latinization as exists is chiefly in actual fittings of the churches, which is unfortunate as it is the first thing to be observed. Few of the new churches have the eikonostasis which is essential, as they themselves emphasise, to the rite. This is said to be, and often is, due to poverty: in a very poor and (numerically) greatly expanding diocese, where there is a constant struggle to build churches and open schools, an eikonostasis is, after all, a detail which can wait—provided, one would add, that it does not wait so long that even its relative importance and immediate connection with the liturgy which they prize is forgotten. Yet it is difficult to be entirely satisfied with the plea of poverty: in one Melkite church in Haifa there are both an altar and a shrine of Ste. Thérèse of Lisieux, both in marble, but no eikonostasis and not even an eikon of our Lord or of the Mother of God. This is an exception, but then again labour is cheap in the East and there must be local

Melkite workmen. With a little zeal and ingenuity simple screens could be erected without vast expense. The eikons alone present a problem and here again the position is somewhat belied, for there are not a few Melkite churches in Galilee which are screenless but contain innumerable eikons in the correct style, if not always of the first class, which are at present propped on stands and ledges all round the church and are only waiting for use. One hopes that the apostolic and liturgical zeal of the Melkites will not long forget this subject.

At Acre, with its crusader walls, there is an older Melkite church on the sea flank of the town and it contains a very fine, elaborately carved and gilded neo-Byzantine screen, with quite good eikons of the period. An idea of it is sufficiently conveyed by the accompanying photographs. At Nazareth the old synagogue now belongs to the Melkites and a simple stone screen surmounted by a row of eikons has been erected. Mr. Edward Bowron is to be thanked for the second eikonostasis here illustrated. It is at Jaffa of Nazareth, a hill village west of Nazareth, above the road to Haifa. Its simple construction might well be adopted. The eikons he has painted in an impressionistic style which does indeed catch the impression of eikons, although the loose technique proves so different from the tightness and precision which are the rightful methods of eikon-painting.¹

The very wide-spread cult of the little Thérèse in the Near East is interesting, and it can hardly be said, as some are inclined to say, that it is sheerly a Latinization and French importation, for on that ground we, as Latin Westerners, would scarcely be permitted to have a special devotion for St. Ephraem and not at all for the more modern Orientals of saintly life. The saints are both universal, belonging, in their sanctity itself, to the whole Church, and localized in the special characteristics of that sanctity; but they are localized not only in space but also in time: Thérèse belongs to the French provinces but she also belongs to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. She belongs, it is true, to a devotional phase in the life of the Church, but one has the impression that in the Near East she has been, in a curious way, dissociated from herself and has become the "miracle-worker in the abstract," the miracle-worker of *this time*.

But it is important not to over-emphasise these rather obvious discrepancies: they are not so fundamental to liturgy and the liturgical spirit as many things; and there can be little doubt that the Melkites have a staunch love of

¹ I am told that this was a case of compromise and that the artist usually works in the traditional style.

their own liturgy and of liturgy itself with which few uniate bodies can compare. There are many excellent things to be said. One does not among them usually find the modern Latin habit of "saying a low Mass," so alien to the Eastern tradition: even in a small place on an ordinary week-day the priest and the "server" chant the liturgy, however simply, and where there are several priests there is commonly celebration. The rite and the vestments are preserved integral—the Byzantine liturgy used in Arabic, though Greek can equally be used and here and there a Greek phrase is sometimes preserved in the Arabic surrounding. The chant is in a good Constantinopolitan tradition, though on the whole the voices are poor.

That the Melkites are of the Byzantine rite at all is due to the medieval weight of imperial Constantinople, for, in common with the other Christians of these parts, they were properly of the Syriac rite—the considerable expansion into the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria is comparatively modern: they belong in origin to Antioch and the Antiochene rite—but by the end of the thirteenth century the more modern imperial liturgy had triumphed. It seems now to be best, especially perhaps in Palestine, since the corresponding dissident body is definitely Greek and even, in its hierarchy, Hellenic.

In the history of the Melkites during the last few hundred years three "congregations" of Basilians have played a very large part, and of this part the monastery of St. Saviour of the Transfiguration on the Lebanon hills above Saida (the ancient Sidon), the fountainhead of the "Salvatoriau Basilians," has had a great share. Many patriarchs have come from it and many have fled to it for a greater or less period. Some have used it as their patriarchal seat for a considerable time. It has often been for the Melkites the centre of the stormy history of those parts under Turkish rule, and has not escaped the attacks, burnings and pillagings which form so integral a part of that history.

In February it stood with an air of tranquillity upon its hill amongst the terraced and cultivated valleys, the purple and scarlet and white anemones and the crimson cyclamen, in the vivid green spring; looking down over ranges of hills to the sea near Sidon in its orange groves; looking up over ranges of hills to the snow mountains of the Lebanon. In front was the solid new block of the junior seminary with its dormitories, refectory, class rooms and church, and its big courtyard, shut in, fortress-wise. Behind, with a small road between, were the older and more irregular buildings of the senior seminary and monastery proper,

with arched doors and vaulted rooms and corridors. Here in one wing, is the guest-house, and here are the library which is of considerable interest, and the older church which contains quite a good eikonostasis of some age, part of which is shown in the accompanying photograph. The second photograph, taken from inside the screen, gives a side view of the altar with its pillared baldachino and hanging silver eucharistic dove. Here the senior seminary sings its liturgy and office. This is the largest of the oriental Catholic monasteries and a fascinating and hospitable place. Most of the large number of monks are parochial clergy, scattered over the whole country. As they do their studies in their own monastery they are rather less affected by French influence than the students of the seminaries run by European priests. In Galilee the Archbishop, himself a monk of St. Saviour's, draws most of his clergy from the monastery. Yet in some small hill villages there is a difficulty, as there is little for a priest with years of training behind him to do, nor is it always easy for a celibate clergy to carry on its work. Young married men of promising character are therefore sometimes taken, given a short training, and ordained, then sent back to their own villages where they carry on their own means of livelihood and meanwhile sufficiently minister to their flock. A married clergy is, of course, in the full Eastern tradition, whether Catholic or dissident.

The writer looks back with very great pleasure and gratitude to the almost overwhelming hospitality of the Melkite clergy towards a quite unimportant traveller. Traditional Arab hospitality has indeed been turned into the Christian virtue. Bishops who asked one to meals, drove one to see churches and schools in their car, or, when they themselves must work, put that car at one's disposal; clergy who gave up all their ordinary arrangements for several days on end to act as one's guide; parish clergy who welcomed one with so much kindness and the ever ready Turkish coffee and sweets; monastic superiors who, having discovered a mutual love for St. Ignatius of Antioch, went out of their way to talk about the Fathers in alternating French and German; schools—and this was a somewhat embarrassing experience—which changed the days of their holidays so that one could see them working and hear the children doing "English conversation" and reciting English verses—sometimes rather odd commercial English; still the Melkites are ahead of the government in teaching English even in village schools—all this was a revelation in more than one Christian virtue.

E. J. B. FRY.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We intend in this review of certain periodicals of the past year not so much to criticize their contents as to give our readers an idea of current opinion on Eastern Church matters. Comment of course will be necessary on occasion.

CATHOLIC REVIEWS

Irénikon.

Beyond question the outstanding feature in 1938 was the series of articles (from January to September) by Dom C. Lialine, entitled *De la méthode irénique*, a magnificent treatise, not only on the aims and method of *Irénikon* in particular, but on the spirit which animates all those who are working for the ultimate attainment of Christ's last request that we "should be one." Experience has shown that the attempt to win back individuals only increases the misunderstanding and reserve of the remainder, and so, since in the case of the Eastern Churches, whose life centres round the very same Sacrifice and sacraments as our own and whose tradition, hallowed by centuries of persecution, is that they are the true Church founded by Christ, the danger of *formal* schism is sufficiently remote, the method which received the emphatic approval of the late Holy Father was that which strives to prepare the ground for corporate reunion.

A striking commentary on the possibilities latent in this reverent approach to the consecrated traditions of the East and on the new hope which it has awoken is afforded by the letter of the late Orthodox Archbishop of Athens in the last number of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY, and in the periodical under review by the regular co-operation of Orthodox writers in every number.

The centenary of the death of John Adam Moehler in April called forth an erudite analysis of his work by Père Congar, O.P. In November the third chapter of R. Belmont's *Life of the Patriarch Cyril Lukaris* appeared, and in the same number an Anglican appreciation of the late Dr. Walter Howard Frere by the Rev. I. R. Young.

Apart from its large share in the chronicle of contemporary happenings, Russia is studied by G. Fedotov in the light of its first conversion under St. Vladimir in 988, and once more Madame E. Behr-Sigel has added an entirely new chapter to Western hagiography in her study of "lay" sanctity in ancient Russia and, in particular, the "fools for Christ," who have always been a characteristic feature of Russian Christianity.

Of more general interest, apart from the almost incredible number of book reviews, are M. Bowyer on the *rapprochement*

between Orthodoxy and Protestantism, and Dom O. Rousseau on "What is a Latin?"

DOM JULIAN STONOR.

Russie et Chrétienté.

Two issues of this review are to hand: No. 4 for October to December, 1937, and a large No. 1 inscribed 1938-39.

The short articles of "Istina" which preface every issue—in this case deducing the internal need for religious reunion from the Incarnation and from the nature of the human soul respectively (*Exigences de l'Incarnation* and *Tempérament et Education*)—cannot be too highly praised; they are perfect jewels of practical theology, concise, sharp-cut, monumental. The earlier volume contains an article by J. Danzas on the sources of Russian theological thought, and another valuable contribution is the essay by Professor Timachev on the development of modern transport in Czarist Russia—delayed, and in fact not yet completed, by Communist mishandling. The pages devoted to a chronicle of Soviet economic and social development reveal grave disorganization in almost every sphere of economic activity: agriculture, mining, oil-getting, textiles, heavy industry, transport; and for every allegation, evidence is drawn from the Soviet official press. Eight pages are devoted to a series of quotations from an article on the Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh by M. L. Zander, a Russian Orthodox delegate to these Conferences. They cannot, according to the writer quoted, be regarded as in any way œcumenical: they were essentially large gatherings saturated with the spirit of Protestantism. United action could only proceed by neglecting essential dogmatic differences (as at Oxford), or by admitting complete disagreement in fundamental doctrines (as at Edinburgh), "so as to place before the Œcumenical Movement a formidable obstacle."

The second issue which comes under our notice contains three articles which should interest the Latin student of the note of sanctity in the Church: J. Danzas contributes an account of St. Vladimir and Christian origins in Russia; two Russian Orthodox monasteries are described, historically and as they survive to-day under the protection of Finland, by S. M. Quandalle; and in a new series of studies of the spirituality of the Russian people, Gamayoun examines that phenomenon so strange to Western eyes but so persistent in the East, of the soul which chooses the way of foolishness on its way to sanctity, "*les fous pour le Christ*." Among the quotations we find the greater part of an official article on the Communist moral code translated from *Komsolkaia Pravda*,

the organ of Communist youth in Russia, an article which has great documentary and historic value. Another most interesting quotation is an article on Anglican Orders by an émigré Russian writer, G. Kaloménié, in which he comes to the conclusion that the Orthodox Churches can neither receive nor condemn outright the Anglican hierarchy as true representatives of the Apostolic Succession.

In both issues under review some account is given of Russian Orthodoxy in exile and an article by G. Chavelsky considers certain proposed reforms to their church. The U.S.S.R. section of the second volume indicates from Soviet sources how, in spite of continued silence in the international press, merciless persecution of all forms of Christian worship continues unchecked, the slightest suspicion of religious sympathy being enough to cause loss of employment—especially in the schools—social ostracism or criminal prosecution.

DOM THOMAS RIGBY.

Acta Academiae Velehradensis, 1938. (4 fascicules).

In the first part of the *Acta* for 1938, Dr. Thomas Kurent, S.O.Cist., completes his discussion of the teaching of Saints Cyril and Methodius on the Roman primacy. Dr. Kurent first proves from Roman documents (the letters of Pope John VIII, the *Liber Diurnus Rom. Pontif.*) that the professions of faith made by St. Methodius in Rome acknowledged the primacy of the Roman pontiff and that at his consecration he promised obedience to the Pope. Five points in Slav documents are discussed: St. Cyril's translation of Matthew XVI, 18, as "upon this Peter"; the identification in the Life of Methodius of the Pope with the apostle Peter; the antonomastic use of the title "apostolic" for the Pope; the clear exposition of the papal position with regard to general councils in the list of councils given in the Life of Methodius; and finally the Slavonic scholium against the so-called 28th Canon of Chalcedon. These last two points especially demand and receive from Dr. Kurent extensive discussion. He concludes that both documents were actually written by St. Cyril, the latter in Greek later translated by Methodius or his disciples; this conclusion is important for it establishes the fact that Cyril and Methodius were great witnesses to the Roman primacy at a time when the schism was already beginning. In the following parts of the *Acta* Dr. Kurent expounds the teaching of Pope Nicholas I on the Roman primacy from the original documents—certainly the best way of showing that it was based on the Scriptures and the tradition of the Church and not the Pope's own invention (as Orthodox, Old Catholics

and Protestants have alike asserted), nor based on spurious documents; but we are not sure that the Pope's line of action, especially after the Council of 861, was as wise and praiseworthy as his doctrine.

Fr. G. Hofmann, S.J., follows up his 1937 essays on the Florentine definition on the procession of the Holy Ghost with three similar essays discussing the preparation of the definitions in the Bull of Union with the Greeks concerning the Holy Eucharist (indirectly touching on the question of the form of consecration), the full power of the Pope over the whole Church and the addition of the "Filioque" to the Creed. Fr. H. M. Jura'k, O.P., writes of the foundation of the Russian province of the Dominicans, and other articles treat of subjects as various as the concepts of grace in the New Testament and the Bhagavadgita, and matrimonial impediments among the united Bulgarians. Fr. Salaville writes on the unity of the Church and the problem of reunion, taking Fr. Congar's *Chrétiens désunis* for his text.

DOM THEODORE RICHARDSON.

NON-CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

The Christian East. (Vol. XVII, Nos. 3 and 4, 1937, and Vol. XVIII, Nos. 1 and 2, 1938).

These two volumes are both *double numbers*. A great deal of what is in the first number has been already treated of in the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY during the past year, e.g., the Edinburgh Conference; the "Zöë" Movement in Greece—the Archimandrite Constantinides' article, *Life and Work in the Church of Greece*, goes into more detail but it is in bulk about this movement. There is a very full paper on *The Coptic Orthodox Church* by the Eighomanoous Ibrahim Luka (who came as a delegate to Edinburgh), however in places it shows a sad lack of ordinary knowledge concerning what the Catholic Church teaches, e.g., *Papal Supremacy and its Infallibility*, and *Forgiveness in the Next World*. On the other hand, we read the very interesting statement concerning the two natures in Christ: "The allegation of the Churches that the Coptic Church teaches the confusion of the two natures is untrue, as is shown by many of her confessions and among them the closing one of the Mass, and also by her rejection of the Eutykhian heresy that taught the confusion of the two natures in Christ." Such Catholic theologians as Abbé J. Lebon and Father Jugie would agree with this statement.

Turning to the second volume, we find much information that has not already been given in these pages. An account

of the new Serbian Patriarch, his Holiness Dr. Gavriilo. Dr. Gavriilo was born in Montenegro in 1881. During the course of his career he acquired a knowledge of the Greek, Russian, Bulgarian and French languages. He received the degree of Doctor of Theology in 1909, having studied at Constantinople and at the University of Athens. He represented the Serbian Church at the Pan-Orthodox Congress in Constantinople in 1923, and when he was chosen as Patriarch, he had held the position of Metropolitan of Montenegro since 1921.

There is also an account of Professor Alivisatos who received a Doctorate in Divinity, *honoris causa*, from the University of Oxford last June. He is an outstanding figure in the whole Orthodox Church. Though a layman, he is a canonist and theologian of repute and exercises a certain leadership at the Athens Theological Faculty; he was president of the Conference of Orthodox Theologians held at Athens. He is an enthusiast for the promotion of solidarity between all Christian churches, though a strict guardian of Orthodox tradition, and has been closely associated with the Faith and Order Movement from its very beginning.

Among the obituary notices good space is deservedly given to the memory of Professor Frank Gavin of the Episcopal Church of America, who died on March 20th, 1938, having only arrived at middle life. His loss in the cause of the Anglican-Orthodox movement will be great indeed. In his own country he had specialized in Hebrew and Syriac (he had worked on the Syriac version of the Canon of the Antiochene Liturgy), and had gone to Athens as a research student in the Theological Faculty of the University; he sat under Professor Christos Androustos. The outcome of this study was his *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Theological Thought* (see EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY, July 1937). In 1935 he was attached to the Delegation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bucarest, and was also at the Conferences of Life and Work at Oxford, and Faith and Order at Edinburgh in 1937, and he was preparing for the Lambeth Conference of 1940. R.I.P.

There are some other articles of interest, but two are of special importance which we must note. And first that of *Patristics and Modern Theology*, by Father George Florovsky. This paper was read at Athens to the Conference of Orthodox Theologians in 1937. He pleads here, as in his book (referred to later) for a revival and development of patristic teaching. We will give some quotations: "The need to face and to meet in a *new* theological synthesis the difficulties of *our own age* is dangerously over-emphasized by most of them (*i.e.*, our theological students). And usually a forced distinction is

uttered between the *dogmas* and the *doctrine*. . . . What is of real importance is not so much an identity of spoken words, as the real continuity of lives and mind, and inspiration. . . . One has to grow older or to go farther, but *in the same direction* or, better to say, *in the same type and spirit*. . . . Two points must be here specially mentioned. . . . (1) Even historically it is hardly possible to isolate the formal or defined dogma from that inclusive doctrinal context in which only the definition itself possesses its full value and meaning. The connection of 'dogma' and (patristic) 'doctrine' is much deeper and more organic than the partisans of a new doctrinal synthesis would like to admit. Patristic teaching for an historian in any case is the best and the most natural key to the dogma. This interpretation may be incomplete, then one has to continue *the same line*. Holy Fathers are still leading the way, one has to walk farther, and many views quite unexpected do appear, but the road is still the same, the kingly way of the Catholic understanding. . . . (2) And this is perhaps the main point. Holy Fathers are more than merely theologians. They are teachers, 'teachers of the Church,' *doctores Ecclesiae*, οἱ διδασκαλοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . . In the Church we call those who have attained it (*i.e.*, the level of Catholicity) Doctors and Fathers, because *from them we hear not only their personal profession, but also the testimony of the Church*; they speak to us from its Catholic completeness, from completeness of a full life of grace. This 'Catholic mentality' constitutes the incomparable methodological value or authority of patristic writings. And again, this does not mean that all personal opinions of the Fathers must also be held, or that one has to follow any particular teacher among the Fathers. The first task for the present generation of Orthodox theologians would be to develop their own ideas and views, but to bear witness solely to the immaculate faith of the Mother Church! *Cor nostrum sit semper in Ecclesia!* . . . The full truth about Holy Fathers is that *they have created a new philosophy*, very different from both Platonism and Aristotelianism, or anything else. . . . And 'modern philosophy' must be examined first of all from within the Catholic self-consciousness of the Church. It would be precisely ridiculous to check Christian doctrine by some Kantian or Hegelian criterion, or by that of Lotze, Bergson and somebody else. What is really required is not a new language, or any new glorious visions, but only a better spiritual sight which would enable us again to discern in the fulness of the Catholic experience as much as our spiritual Father and forefathers did. . . . This re-discovery of the Patristic sight would be the only real step forward. . . . One point must be emphasized here. No particular philo-

sophy has been ever ' canonized ' in any doctrinal or dogmatic statements."

" And still all these traditional schemes and formularies are through and through *hellenistic or Greek*. This ' *hellenism* ' is really so-to-say canonized. It is a new, *Christian Hellenism*. It is a common atmosphere of the Church, created by a series of Christian generations. Our Christian worship in its essential is hellenistic (as it was shown quite recently in most illuminating publications of the great Benedictine scholar, Father Odo Casel, of the Abbey of Maria Laach). The same one has to say of our eikons. The same is true of our doctrinal formularies too. In a sense *the Church itself is hellenistic*, is a hellenistic formation—or in other words, Hellenism is a standing category of the Christian existence. . . . And thus any theologian must pass an experience of a spiritual hellenization (or re-hellenization)."

This will show both the value of the article, of Father Florovsky's work in general, and also of the Theological Faculty of the University of Athens. (The short account of the three outstanding personages mentioned above all bear witness to the importance of the University of Athens in Orthodox circles.) Here is a work in which Catholics and Orthodox could perhaps join!

The second article is the *Lecture on the Church of England* read by Dr. Parsons, Anglican Bishop of Southwark, to the Anglo-Hellenic League at Athens on February the 19th, 1938. The editor terms it a simple and succinct exposition of the history and tradition of the Anglican communion. It is printed in full and takes fifteen pages.

We think the editor's description of this account is most excellent, but it is the description of a modern Anglican, one whose background has been that of what he himself terms "the three great movements which have influenced present-day Anglicanism," viz., the Evangelical Revival, the Oxford Movement, and the "Broad Church" Movement. This being so, he gives a most accurate statement of what the Anglican Church is as the result of these schools of thought. He also gives to his Greek audience the central Anglican tradition and both his explanation of the Church of England as *sui generis* among the Reformed churches, and his treatment of the position of the Church in relation to Parliament are all that can be desired. It is when he deals with pre-Reformation England that he tends to be somewhat inaccurate, largely by the suggested atmosphere he creates through omissions than by actual wrong statements; e.g., he treats the Celtic Church as if it had no connection with Rome whatsoever, and of England's relations with Rome as almost entirely concerned with the temporal

and financial domination of this country by the Papacy—it is, even if unconscious, special pleading. Yet we have called this article important; important for Catholics, too, because whatever be the history of the change of religion in England in the sixteenth century, it is good for us to realize the present Anglican position. It is this central Anglican tradition, the outcome of the Caroline divines and of such scholars as Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, Creighton, Gore and Frere that we should think of when we are dealing with questions of reunion. It is this central party that is getting a more sober and solid Catholic outlook on things which is not a little due to its contact with the Orthodox. The insistence of the Orthodox on dogma and tradition together with their sacramental view of life and veneration of the Mother of God in contact with what has been termed the Anglican tradition is a combination which should help forward the reunion of Christendom.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift, XXVIII, 1—4. 1938.

As this quarterly is concerned primarily with the Old Catholics and their efforts towards a general reunion—among Protestants as well as with Rome and the East—articles on the Eastern Churches appear only at comparatively rare intervals. On the other hand there are nearly always short accounts of the latest communications between one or other of the Oriental churches and the Protestant assemblies.

In the January number there is an article by Ernst Gaugler on Dr. Friedrich Heiler's recent book *Urkirche und Ostkirche*. He compares the present volume with a previous edition (1923). On the whole he is sympathetic with the author's treatment of the history and teaching of the dissident Oriental churches. Three or four pages of this number are devoted to a survey of some of the works undertaken by the Catholic Church during the last few years in connection with the East.

The next issue contains a declaration by Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira at the World Conference at Edinburgh on certain fundamental points of Orthodox belief. This he felt bound to make on behalf of the Orthodox delegates in view of some opinions expressed in the papers circulated by the Conference.

The July number gives us an interesting essay on *Die Mongolen und das Christentum* by Berthold Spuler. This historical sketch covers the period known as the Syrian Renaissance, when Persia and the Near East were under the sway of the Tartars. For nearly one hundred years—the

greater part of the thirteenth century—these rulers treated their Christian subjects with toleration. This was due at first to their indifference towards the religion of their subjects ; but later when the Khans saw in an alliance with the Christian peoples a means of fighting the common enemy, the Mohammedans, they distinctly favoured the Churches. In this way a golden era set in for both the Nestorians and Jacobites in those parts. But towards the end of the century the Khans were converted to Islam, and not many years later the Mongolian rule in the Near East collapsed altogether, so that the Christians were made to feel the weight of oppression once more.

The whole of the October copy is confined to a report of the fourteenth International Old Catholic Congress held at Zurich from 25th to 29th August. There were eight or nine representatives of the Orthodox Church present ; and one of them, the Metropolitan Germanos, from London, read a paper. His address, entitled "The Orthodox Church and efforts towards Union," is for the most part a sum of the impressions gathered by the Orthodox delegates at the various Conferences they have attended since the publication of the Encyclical by the Œcumenical Patriarchate in 1920. The Archbishop again stresses the fact that the Orthodox Church cannot yield on even one point of dogma, but that at the same time there is considerable agreement in moral and social questions, and for that reason the Oxford Conference created a more favourable impression in the Orthodox world than that held at Edinburgh.

DOM GILBERT SMITH.

Ὁ ὀρθόδοξος Παρατηρητής *The Orthodox Observer*, 1938.

The Archimandrite Athenagoras Kavada, protosynkellos of the Greek archbishopric in America is manager of this periodical which has for scope the maintenance of Christian and patriotic sentiments in the minds and hearts of the faithful. It provides articles recalling the religious life of the fatherland and expounding some point of religious teaching, and a chronicle of the principal events in the archdiocese. Thus, for instance, the number for 16th January, 1938, contains an analysis of a pamphlet by the Metropolitan Joachim of Demetraide (formerly Bishop of Boston) on the reorganization of the parochial clergy in Greece (to be continued) ; two leading editorial articles on Liturgy and the Edinburgh Conference of Faith and Order ; a commentary on the words of the Our Father (Thy kingdom come) ; short notes on some liturgical feast or current event ; and finally a list of the chief engage-

ments of the Archbishop Athenagoras ; Greek ecclesiastical affairs in America ; accounts of schools and philanthropic institutions and marriage announcements. *The Orthodox Observer*, we may frankly say, is a model parish magazine.

D.P.D.

Sobornost. (1938. Nos. 13—16).

Last year's issue of *Sobornost* is full of interest. There are articles by Paul Anderson on *The Present Soviet Policy on Religion* in three numbers (Nos. 13, 15, 16), and *A Short Review of the History of the Rumanian Church* by S. Reli (Nos. 15 and 16), and others of value ; but the main theme of the whole issue for 1938 is the Reunion Movement, and it is this that we intend to consider.

The first article dealing with the question is one by the Bishop of Brechin, *Towards 1940* (No. 13, p. 4). He deals with the Reunion Movement from 1930 and looks ahead to the Lambeth Conference of 1940.

At the beginning he makes a very important statement : "It has been the experience of all who have co-operated in conferences directed towards ultimate reunion that one of our primary difficulties is that where the notion of the Church differs so widely the meaning of union varies correspondingly. One of the great discoveries of modern Protestant thought is the centrality for Christians of the conception of the Universal Church. . . . But we must not jump to the conclusion that it is exactly the Catholic conception of the Church at which it has arrived. For the new Protestant 'œcumenical' thought conceives of membership in the visible universal Church as conferred by membership in any of the Churches : the Catholic attitude is rather that Baptism admits to the one organic whole which is the Body of Christ, and that membership in this Body may persist in spite of failure to maintain external relations with it. . . . There is a world of difference between the two ideas ; and there must therefore always be a corresponding difference in the meaning of reunion as envisaged by Catholics and Protestants respectively.

"Readers of *Sobornost* are, as such, chiefly interested in the possibilities of reunion between Orthodox and Anglicans and in steps which seem to lead in that direction. Here also there is a difference of outlook which makes it difficult for either side to enter fully into the mind of the other. To the Orthodox unity is principally dogmatic, to the Anglicans it is principally hierarchical. In approaching the Orthodox we are anxious to show that we have the original accredited ministry of the Catholic Church . . ." (he then mentions

the autocephalous Orthodox Churches that acknowledge Anglican orders). "But to the Orthodox the mere possession of a valid ministry is far from sufficient. Indeed such validity as they recognize in any ministrations except their own is very partial. . . . The great difficulty therefore on their side about reunion is that of discovering what exactly is the official belief of Anglicans about the Incarnation, the Priesthood and the Sacraments. This is what stands in the way of full reunion." He then speaks of the report of the joint doctrinal committee of 1932 and of the Anglican declaration to the Rumanian Synod in 1935, and says that "this agreement (*i.e.*, the result of 1935) is the nearest approach to full dogmatic union which has yet been attained, and may open the door to full *communio in sacris*. For the present Orthodox and Anglicans have to be content to make use of each other's ministrations in emergencies and not otherwise." (Only of course with those Orthodox who consider Anglican orders valid.—EDITOR.) "It is perhaps worth while, in the interests of candour, to mention one obstacle to full reunion which is not always remembered. It seems to be generally assumed that the only real difficulty about Anglo-Orthodox reunion is the hesitation of the Orthodox, but there are hesitations also on the Anglican side." He then speaks of the Evangelical party and says, among other things: "Now the Evangelicals have no objection to reunion with a Christian body with whose tenets and practice they do not agree; but they do object very strenuously, and very naturally, to the idea of reunion on the basis of an agreement with which they cannot concur." One wonders whether this is not so with many other members of the Church of England, though they do not state it as clearly as the Evangelicals who at least have not lost their sense of the value of doctrinal statement. The Orthodox acceptance of divorce in certain cases is also given as a grave difference. In conclusion he states: "It seems to follow that we should not be in too great haste to press for the day of complete reunion; and that what is sometimes called 'economic' inter-communion should be our present goal in the case of the Orthodox. On practical grounds this is all that is really a matter of urgency."

The Bishop then reviews the situation in regard to reunion among the other Churches since 1930—Anglicans and Old Catholics, the negotiations with the Church of Finland, the United South Indian Church, and others. He comments thus on the Conference of Faith and Order held in Edinburgh (August, 1937): "On the whole it may be said with confidence that what that Conference effected was rather a clearing of the minds of the delegates than any actual advance towards

reunion. Indeed in some ways perhaps this very clarification may have dimmed the hope of union in some too sanguine minds." As regards Anglo-Roman reunion he notes that there is much personal goodwill and mutual appreciation on both sides, that Anglicans are increasingly inclined to recognize the Pope as the natural leader of Christendom, but on the dogmatic side he says "we are still in the region of 'explanations,' and for the present we seem likely to remain there. There is much to explain; and, to be frank, some things which seem to us to need something near to 'explaining away.'"

We have given much space to this article of Bishop Mackenzie because he is the general editor of a series of essays—*Union of Christendom*—published to prepare people's minds for the International Convention of 1940 (see *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*, April 1937, p. 104), and also because it gives us a good basis to judge and discuss what follows.

The above is a review of the question from one who is in an official position in the Anglican Church; we now pass on to a discussion of the problem from the unofficial position of the Fellowship. The discussion, however, is of great value.

Before we examine some of the papers read at the Conference at High Leigh in July 1938, we will draw our readers' attention to a consideration on these very papers in *Footnotes (V)*—*Kin*, by A. F. D-B. (No. 15, p. 22). The problem of Latinism was raised at the Conference; "Latinism" (we are told) "was introduced as a rallying point against Liberalism, but in debate it joined in instinctive battle with Hellenism." We are then introduced to Father George Florovsky's argument (from his book, *Paths of Russian Theology*); Father Florovsky wants a new Orthodox polemic developed from a creative return to the Greek Fathers; that this would "re-interpret and redeem the religious tragedy of the West. But East must know the West better, and more attention must be paid to the age-long experience of Catholicism." Father George is then quoted: "This does not mean borrowing and accepting Roman doctrines, nor does it involve an imitative Romanism. But at any rate an Orthodox thinker will find a more adequate source of creative stimulation in the great systems of Scholasticism, in the experience of Catholic mystics and in the theological experience of modern Catholicism than in the philosophy of German idealism, in the Protestant critical science of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, or even in the dialectical theology of our own days." "This," the author says, "many Anglicans are saying and even more are practising." To proceed with the article: "'theology can be truly catholic in Hellenism alone.' All

theology, not just Russian theology. Russian theology must throw off the influences of Tridentine theology as well as of Protestant scholasticism. But *in general* Hellenism is the eternal category of Christian existence." A certain amount of criticism of this extolling of Hellenism will be found in the article of the Metropolitan of Sofia in another number of *Sobornost* (*Orthodoxy*, in No. 14, p. 10).

But we now come to the papers themselves.

And first, *The Significance of Anglo-Orthodox Relations*, by the Rev. A. M. Ramsay (No. 15, p. 3). He takes the programme of the Conference at High Leigh that invited its members to join one of three seminars on Doctrine, Worship, or Order, and makes this the text of his thesis: "Here are three things which in the true life of the Church are one and inseparable, but we men in our sinfulness and blindness are compelled to think of them separately and to put asunder things which in Christ are utterly one. It is of *this* kind of schism that I want to speak. We give a great deal of thought to the tragedy of outward schism between Canterbury and Rome and Constantinople; we need to think also of the inward schism (within us all) of elements of religion which Christ has bound together. I believe that our Anglican and Orthodox contacts are significant just because they throw much light upon this latter aspect of schism." With this in view he works out his thesis under three headings: *What is schism?*; *What tendencies do we see towards the healing of these inward schisms?*; *From the Latin Church, What of the Church of England? What of the Eastern Church?*; and *What of the future?*

He prefaces his treatment of the subject with the statement that although no human language can sufficiently express these things yet the Greek language has words in the New Testament which come wonderfully near doing so. He then goes on to explain what has been referred to above as "inward schism"—"schisms between doctrine and worship and life," "worship without doctrine—the pietism which repels and divides because it is a self-centred thing," "order divorced from the context of doctrine and worship—the prelatism which repels and divides." After which we are asked to consider the tendencies towards the healing of these inward schisms. The Latin Church is taken first and Latin scholasticism is put forward as a healer of inward schism in the same way as the papacy claims to heal the outward. But the author is not satisfied with this conclusion and contrasts Latin terminology with the Greek words of the New Testament to the detriment of the Latin—*e.g.*, *fides* and *πίστις*, *gratia* and *χάρις*, *corpus* and *σῶμα*. Of the last he says: "the Church becomes *corpus*, an institution, rather than *σῶμα*, an organism."

Surely this is very far fetched ; would the strictest scholastic translate *Corpus Christi* as the Institution of Christ ? He concludes in general that " Thomism is inwardly schismatic."

We think the mistake of the writer is to isolate the scholastic from his patristic past (and in these days, from the patristic revival), whilst also forgetting the persistent if quieter tradition of the Roman Liturgy. It will not be out of place to quote from *Blackfriars* (January 1938) ; here Father Gervase Mathew, O.P., writes on the patristic revival : " Only a decadent Thomist would think it treason to supplement St. Thomas from the Fathers. To St. Thomas it would be the inevitable corollary of his conception of patristics as a source. Ultimately the theology of the *Summa* is a synthesis between the Augustinianism of the eleventh century scholastics and the new knowledge of the Greek Fathers that was slowly drifting westward. A revival in patristic theology would only bring a clearer understanding of St. Thomas's theological thought." It should also be remembered that even a Latin is not bound to be a *disciple* of St. Thomas, though he cannot but feel the effect of his influence.

He then turns to the *Church of England* and the *Eastern Church* ; of the former he quite rightly says : " Her theology has been essentially Biblical theology, her theologians have been soaked in the Greek language." This being so, it is all the more remarkable to read that " we (*i.e.*, Anglicans), think too little of what ' we are ' as Christians." The New Testament, especially St. John and St. Paul, is very explicit !

In considering the Orthodox he admits that " if there is one word of sense or meaning in the thesis of this paper I have learnt it from contact with the Christians of the East," and that this contact is important for us " because we learn the meaning of that orthodoxy which is within ourselves." One wonders whether the writer has not forgotten his " Kin " ? or perhaps if he were to go deeper into the source of the Western Tradition he would find something very much akin to what he values in the Eastern Tradition. Perhaps a deeper realization of the Liturgy would help to heal the schism.

Much of what is suggested at the end of the last paragraph is worked out in detail in Dr. Thomas Parker's paper, *The Vision of Unity—The Future : Hopes and Fears* (No. 16, p. 14). At any rate in the section dealing with *Hopes*, he is at one with the last paper in attributing to Russian thought transplanted to Western Europe a great part in a renaissance of Christian thinking, though the ground had been prepared in the Church of England by the Oxford Movement. But unlike the last writer, he sees this revolution in Christian thought as shared in by Roman Catholics, Orthodox and

Anglo-Catholics, "lying deeper than the differences of East and West," and even values "the profundities of the scholastic synthesis." He raises, by the way, an interesting line of thought by suggesting that the Rumanian church might with great justice be called a "bridge Church"—a Latin-speaking people within the Orthodox tradition: "through Rumania we have a means of making a bridge to Greek and Slavonic thought." The great hindrance to the Vision of Unity he considers is the present inability of the Church of England to make up her mind as to whether she wants Unity on Catholic or Pan-Protestant lines.

Father Sergius Bulgakov's paper on *Past and Future* is given in the form of notes from a *Student's Note-Book* (No. 15, p. 8). We will only give the more interesting points. Among his suggestions concerning doctrinal differences, he says: "There is a new need of theological *translation* from one confessional language to another. For mutual understanding, but not to belittle the facts. In some cases dogmatic conflict is unavoidable; but argument is better than anathemas. . . . In this field all are faced with the special task of the age, *i.e.*, to surmount the polemical theology of Reformation and Counter-Reformation." He speaks against "open communion" and says it "may be a new obstacle to intercommunion and final reconciliation between the episcopal Churches."

Intercommunion presupposes "*complete* dogmatic and doctrinal agreement officially and corporately. . . . But recognition unaccompanied by concelebration threatens to remain fruitless and demoralising for both sides." The following is interesting speculation; how far he had the Conference with him or how far other Orthodox theologians would agree is not for us to say. Catholics could not hold this *in toto*. He writes: "Partial intercommunion. Not a definition of Eucharistic communion, which is essentially universal; but a term applicable to a particular case where the realization of the universal is conditioned by the general canonical separation of ecclesiastical bodies. Important to recognise such a possibility in principle. It leads inevitably to a wider and more precise conception of the Church as a *sacramentally* canonical body. In practice it would be realized in limited circles according to need.

"Canonical limits. The closed unity of canonical organization hitherto has been considered the sign defining the limits and structure of an ecclesiastical body. Dogmatically the Church as the Body and the Bride of Christ cannot coincide with any closed organization. Not Rome goes so far. Some sacraments are mutually recognized and are not repeated on

conversion to another confession. Cases of sacramental intercommunion are known already, and are permitted by economy *in casu necessitatis* or *in articulo mortis*."

However much we may disagree with this, what was previously said must be remembered: "intercommunion presupposes complete dogmatic and doctrinal agreement"; in this light alone should the above be judged.

Here we conclude our lengthy survey of a very important subject.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

A number of reviews have been held over till the next issue.—EDITOR.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

ROME.

H.H. Pope Pius XI died on February 10th, 1939. R.I.P.

In Pius XI Christendom has lost an untiring champion of the Reunion of East and West. Pius XI both consolidated the work of previous popes in this great cause (specially the work of Leo XIII and Benedict XV), and also put much of what had remained latent principles into practice; he did pioneer work.

He reiterated all that such popes as Leo XIII had said about the necessity of studying the Eastern Fathers and Liturgies, and again stressed the wrongness of a latinizing policy among Catholics of the Oriental rites, and he also initiated a programme by which the ordinary rank and file of Western Catholics should be brought into closer contact with the mind and tradition of the Christian East. Thus he would have a trained professor of Oriental studies in every seminary and thus also he would like seminaries and colleges to organize from time to time "Eastern Days" at which both masters and students would be able to take part in the celebration of an Eastern Liturgy, listen to papers read on questions concerning the Eastern Churches and take part in any discussion that might follow, in such celebrations he would have the laity take part in wherever possible.

In connection with this educating of the West in the things of the East an important rôle must be assigned to the present work of the Society of Jesus, among which an increasing number of scholastics of Western nationalities are being trained in the theology and traditions of the Christian East and ordained priests of the Byzantine rite.

Although these priests are intended to work in the Christian East, there cannot but be a general reaction towards a deeper

interest in and an understanding of the many theological and philosophical problems bound up with the Eastern Tradition, which lie hid behind the externals of the Eastern rites, among all the members of the Society of Jesus.

This policy, which has received so much encouragement from Pius XI and which has been adopted by other Religious Orders, is often looked upon askance by the Orthodox (due largely to an unfortunate historical background). Time and the Holy Spirit can alone remove prejudice, but if it is borne in mind that this movement is in keeping with the Holy Father's desire, on the one hand to educate the West, and on the other to approach other Christian cultures and also non-Christian cultures in a way that they can understand, and having so approached them to preserve all that is of lasting value, this in itself should at least reassure them.

And yet again can another movement (yet in its infancy) claim encouragement from Pius XI. This may be termed the "Eirenic Movement." The term "eirenic" is used to distinguish it from the above which may be described as apostolic (in the modern use of the word). This particular work is identified with the monks at Amay-sur-Meuse, which priory was founded in response to the Holy Father's appeal to the Benedictines to work for Unity in 1924, and more recently with the Dominicans of Le Saulchoir.

The encyclical letter *Mortalium animos* was issued by the Pope in the January of 1928 as a general warning to those working in the Reunion Movement, and in the September of the same year there appeared the encyclical *Rerum Orientalium* dealing with the Eastern question in particular. In this last letter special reference is made to the Oriental Institute in Rome, and hence by implication to the "eirenic method," since according to the *Motu Proprio* of Pope Benedict XV (founding the Institute) both Catholic and Orthodox students are thought of as studying together. There is now a growing tendency for Catholic and Orthodox students to meet together to consider the truths of their common faith and to discuss in a friendly way their differences.

These and many other enterprises on behalf of the Eastern churches can claim the special support of Pope Pius XI, who said: "Work for the reunion of the dissident Eastern Christians with the Holy See is not just one undertaking of our pontificate: it is *the* undertaking."

H. H. Pope Pius XII was elected on March 2nd; his coronation took place on March 12th, and he took possession of the Basilica of St. John Lateran on March 19th. Κύριε, φύλαττε αὐτὸν εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη, εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη, εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.

GREECE.

THE NEW ARCHBISHOP OF ATHENS.

Chrysanthos Philippides, Bishop of Trebizond, recently elected Archbishop of Athens, was born at Komotini in the province of Maronia (Thrace), in 1881. He completed his studies at the theological school of Halki in 1903 with brilliant success. In the same year he was ordained deacon of the metropolis of Trebizond and appointed preacher at the cathedral and professor at the senior school. In 1907 he was sent for wider studies to Germany and Switzerland. Recalled in 1911 by the œcumenical patriarch, Joachim III, he was nominated Keeper of the Archives of the œcumenical patriarchate and editor of 'Εκκλησιαστικῆς Ἀληθείας, an important organ of the patriarchate. These appointments show in what high esteem he was held by that great churchman, Joachim III. When the metropolitan see of Trebizond fell vacant in 1915, the clergy and people asked with one accord for his election as their metropolitan and he was elected by the Holy Synod.

After the Asia Minor catastrophe he took refuge in Athens where, in 1926, he was named œcumenical representative in Greece.

When peace discussions took place during the Great War, he was invited by the Greek government to go to Paris and London on their behalf over the touchy question of Pontus. He took a very active part, by order of the œcumenical patriarchate, in the preliminary talks in favour of a *rapprochement* of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, which were organized by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1926 he was sent as representative of the œcumenical patriarchate to Albania to deal with the question of the Albanian Orthodox, in 1931 to Antioch to settle the question of the patriarchate there, and in 1930 and 1935 to Athos to clear various matters. He brought all these missions to a very successful issue, but he was no less remarkable for scholarship. He published many books and articles; that upon the Church of Trebizond was crowned by the Athens Academy last year. The Athens Theological School acknowledged his great qualifications by nominating him hon. doctor during its centenary celebrations recently. The new Archbishop is closely associated with the Zoë Brotherhood. He combines in himself culture, learning, languages, a fiery religious and patristic zeal, social work and organizing ability.

(Summarized from ΟΙ ΤΡΕΙΣ ΙΕΡΑΡΧΑΙ)

GERMANY.

Father Ludwig Berg died in Aix-la-Chapelle at the age of 69. He spent the best part of his life in the work of reunion with the Eastern churches, and his studies on Bolshevism received special acknowledgment from Pope Pius XI. He organised assistance to Russian emigrants in Berlin and was one of the founders of the German Spiritual Academy. He served throughout the War as an army chaplain. His books include : *The Roman Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox ; New Developments in the Russian Religious Spirit and What Soviet Russia has to say for herself*. He re-edited *Ex Oriente*, a symposium of writings by Orthodox and Catholics on religious and philosophical problems concerning East and West, in German, Russian and French.

(Quoted from *The Tablet* Feb. 11th, 1939.)

JERUSALEM.

On February 10th died his Beatitude Archbishop Thorgom Goushakian, Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem.

We quote a summary of the outstanding activities of His Beatitude from *The Church Times* of February 24th, 1939.

"After seven days' mourning, the Armenian community will submit to the Government the name of the chosen *locum tenens*, and then forty days' preparations will be made for the difficult task of choosing a successor.

The late Patriarch was enthroned on December 1st, 1931, and entered enthusiastically upon his new and difficult duties. Apart from administrative work, he devoted many hours each week to teaching in the theological school, where his own wide education was passed on to the new generation ; and he found time for much writing and editing. But it was outside Jerusalem that his greater field was found. The late Patriarch was in charge of many important undertakings, among others the arrangements for the world-wide celebration of the fifteen-hundredth anniversary of the Translation of the Bible into Armenian, and more recently the supervision of the discussions concerning the reform of the Liturgy, Canons and Kalendar of the Armenian Church. It was upon this latter that he was engaged when he died. He had been teaching in the morning, working on some papers submitted to him on Church reform in the afternoon, and was just about to hold a Synod when he had a stroke of apoplexy, and died almost before anyone in the Convent knew that he was ill. . . .

The Armenian Church feels the loss of the late Patriarch very deeply. Now that the see of Etchmiadzin is vacant,

that of Constantinople is sadly circumscribed, and the venerable Catholicos of Sis in Syria is too aged to take an active part in affairs, the Church looked to the Patriarch of Jerusalem for leadership. His place will be hard to fill."

RUMANIA.

On March 6th Mgr. Miron Cristea, Orthodox Patriarch of Rumania and Prime Minister, died at Cannes where he had gone for a rest. R.I.P.

We intend to review the life and work of the late Patriarch in a future issue.

THE SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

The Society has issued two half-yearly Chronicles for 1938.

They are small pamphlets of from 10 to 14 pages, well printed, and on the cover of the second number is a copy of an eikon of St. John Chrysostom by Mr. Philip Hagreen.

They record the activities of the Society, also any book or article dealing with the Eastern Churches published in English is brought before the notice of its readers, and further still instructions of the Holy See concerning these matters are summarized. They are in fact very useful little books and great praise is due to Mr. C. F. L. St. George for producing them.

We give here some interesting information on the Slavonic Press at Grottaferrata taken from the second booklet (pages 10, 11).

"The preparation by the Sacred Congregation of the Oriental Church of a Catholic edition of liturgical books for Russian Catholics was decreed by the Holy Father in the *Motu Proprio Quam sollicita* of December 21st, 1934. The first of these books to be published will be the Slavonic *Sluzhebnik* or *Leiturgikon*, a version of the Greek *Euchologion*. In the new edition the texts of the Russian editions will be followed, except that there will be a few slight alterations of obvious and generally acknowledged errors, while some of the texts will be placed in a better order. Prayers for the Imperial Family will be omitted, and prayers for the Holy Father substituted for those for the Holy Synod. As an aid to the celebrant, some of the prayers that in older editions are indicated only by their initial words will be printed in full. Certain saints not recognised by the Catholic Church will be omitted from the Calendar. Contrary to rumour, new rubrics will not be introduced. There have always existed certain rubrics in the Slavonic books which are better compiled than those in the corresponding Greek books.

In the new edition, all that is proposed is to complete some of these and arrange them in a more satisfactory manner. At present this new edition will only supply the needs of Russian Catholic parishes abroad. When religious freedom is restored to Russia, there will undoubtedly be a very great demand for liturgical books, and the Dissidents will then appreciate the fact that the Holy See has preserved and respected their rite most scrupulously. With regard to its artistic merit, the new edition will strive to equal or even surpass the old Russian editions, and will carefully preserve all the characteristics of the Russian style. A special Slavonic Press has been installed at the monastery of Grottaferrata near Rome, where several Slavonic monks will be in charge of the printing. As the best edition of the Greek book of Hours (*Horologion*), was published by the Grottaferrata Press in 1917, it is certain that the new edition of the Slavonic liturgical books will be in no way inferior to the best editions formerly published in Kiev and Moscow. As in the Russian rite a number of liturgical books are used instead of a Missal, the first to be published will be the *Sluzhebnik* containing the three Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom, St. Basil and the Presanctified, together with Vespers, Matins, parts of the Proper and a Calendar. Should funds permit, the book of the Epistles, the book of the Gospels, the book of Hours, and the Ritual (*Trebnik*) will then be published. The preliminary work has been completed and the printing of the books will begin as soon as the necessary funds are available. As a considerable number of copies will have to be issued free of cost, there is little prospect of any profit being made from the sale of this edition. A contribution of £32 10s. 0d. was sent by members of the Society of St. John Chrysostom to His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant in 1917, followed by a further small sum in July last.

Further contributions from those who are anxious to expedite the production of this new edition of the Slavonic liturgical books will be gratefully received by the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Neil Baynes, O.B.E., 39, Roland Gardens, S.W.7."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following has been sent in to us by Dr. Hartog and it seems to us that it should be placed under this Correspondence for at least indirectly it throws some light on "Whither Orthodoxy."

We have had to change one or two phrases, otherwise we give it exactly as it was sent though we think it sounds rather exaggerated; certainly it is quite common in the West to find photographs of the bishop as well as that of the Pope in the homes of the people, in convents and presbyteries.

Perhaps the title "Whither Catholicism in the Near East?" might suit the case.

WHAT DO THEY THINK ABOUT US?

It is a kind of Catholic pride that makes us always speak about the Orthodox, and seldom about that other question, what they are thinking about us!

We think about the Orthodox in quite a good sense, that is to say, the Western divines. For my friend, Mr. Edward Bowron, rightly wrote in the last issue of the *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*: "I must, however, frankly admit that I have been appalled by the stupid and ignorant hostility shown towards the Orthodox by Catholics, of both Latin and Byzantine rite, in those parts of the world where these two great religious communions live side by side."

I think these words should be written on the desks of all the clergy working in the East. For, alas, it is not only Mr. Bowron's experience. I myself am privileged to be acquainted with the higher ranks of both Catholics and Dissidents in the Balkan countries. And every time I ask myself, how it is possible that Catholics not only show no love, but even insult their separated brethren. Is the reason perhaps that they fear the Orthodox?

Anyhow, one can say that those Catholics who *love* the Orthodox come from the West. We may organize "Oriental weeks," etc., in the West, but as long as the actual Catholic clergy—(of course there are many noble persons)—continue to show that "stupid and ignorant hostility," we do our work in vain.

I will here give the difficulties about reunion, as I noticed them in the Near East. A distinction has to be made between the generality of the laymen and the more cultivated people and higher clergy.

The first "class":

1 (a) The fact that the priest has no beard is an obstacle. And since this is not essential, I think Catholics are guilty for sending to the East priests clean shaved. We have to respect people's opinion and tradition. Not only priests of Byzantine rite, but of Latin rite too, going to the East, ought to have a beard. It is bureaucratism to say—as will be said by religious orders—that the "rule" prescribes shaving. The

priests are for the people, and not for the "rule," and they have to act in conformity with people's opinion.

(b) Catholics are responsible for the people's idea that the Catholics cross themselves with the open hand and the Orthodox with three fingers. For Catholic priests told them so, instead of saying that the Catholic Church is the only proprietor of both practices. It is not the present Orthodox who are the people of the Byzantine rite, nor the Dissident Armenians, but *only* the Catholic Church. We claim to be the only proprietors of the Byzantine rite, of the three-finger-cross and of all other rites. People were astonished when they told me about their "Orthodox" cross, and I told them that it is one of the five crosses of the Catholic Church, and that the Orthodox only took it together with the schism.

(c) The generality of Catholics do not honour their bishop. I hardly ever saw in Catholic houses, under the Pope's picture, the photograph of the bishop. I heard people at their evening prayers saying one "Ave" for the Pope, but not for the bishop. In this way the bishops were, in people's mind, only considered as "administrators." One step further: to Orthodox mind this exclusive honouring of the Pope causes the false idea that the Pope is sinless (even a Doctor of Divinity of the Athens University told me: "Your Church teaches that the Pope cannot commit a sin, and that is a blasphemy for us. . .").

The second "class":

For them the difficulties are: the *filioque*, the infallibility, our Lady's Immaculate Conception, the juridical foundation of the Church.

2 (a) The *filioque*, as being taught by some Western Fathers, might be held as a theologoumenon. But in any case it should be removed from the Creed, as it is an interpolation of later times.

(b) All Dissident divines recognise—theoretically—the primacy of honour of the Bishop of Rome. Some even say that it is held by the Orthodox Church that the Bishop of Rome cannot say anything against the faith, but they base this on history and never admit any privilege *jure divino*.

(c) About the Immaculate Conception they seem to have no fixed idea. One says that our Lady was conceived in sin, but like the Precursor was cleansed in the womb of St. Ann. Another says that she kept hereditary sin until Baptism, but that she never committed another sin, though she could (here the difference between Orthodox and us). Some even say that they *believe* as Catholics, and only protest against the fact that it has been made a dogma, as only matters explicitly taught in Holy Scripture may be proclaimed dogmas.

One learned Archimandrite, a professor in Cairo, told me : " You know that nothing can change in our church. Now we have a veneration towards our Lady, twice as much as the Catholics, in our hymns (he too saw the Latin rite as the mirror of Catholicism and forgot that he kept in his Church the veneration towards our Lady as used in *our* Byzantine rite which is so full of hymns and praise towards St. Mary), but never a voice was to be heard to proclaim her Immaculate Conception. Our church is the proof against Protestantism which rejected the veneration of our Lady, and the proof against Catholicism which exaggerated it. . . . "

(d) The Orthodox relations between hierarchy and subjects are based on love, not on right. Here is a big difference of mentality. The Orthodox churches are democratic ; our Church is dictatorial. Not dictatorial in Hitlerian or Mussolinian sense, but in the sense of Christ, Who surely desired love as the basis of ecclesiastical communion, and imposed love on the Apostles and all their successors, but in His wisdom and with His knowledge of the human heart He founded the mutual juridical discipline and obligations too. And history shows that He was right in doing so, for the Orthodox Church was split up and became the slave of the State, and the religious depth of the people can in no way be compared with the practices of Catholic regions.

I think I have put together all points I heard from the Eastern prelates, and among people. In most cases I added some explanation from the Catholic side. In any case, it will be necessary to study on these lines (rather difficult since Orthodox bishops do not willingly speak with Catholic priests and here we are at a disadvantage in not having the lay theologian of the Orthodox Church). But perhaps we should do better by propagating love towards Dissidents among our own clergy.

JOH. HARTOG, D.D.

THE ARMENIANS.

DEAR FATHER,

The following questions have arisen indirectly out of the excellent articles on the Armenian Church published in your recent number of the *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*.

(i) What is being done among the European clergy for the furtherance of union among the Armenians ? Are similar means being taken as in the case of the Russians ?

(ii) Has anything at all been done in England for these people ? Are they numerous enough to require a priest of their own rite, if such is to be found, and has there been any recent attempt to forward this idea ?

" CLERICUS."

JERUSALEM,
the 11th March, 1939.

SIR,

I should be greatly obliged if you would very kindly publish the following statement in answer to "A British Resident's" article, which appeared in your *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY* for January, 1939, pp. 298-300.

It should be noted at the very outset that the purpose of this statement is to correct some misconceptions and hazy ideas of the "British Resident," which are apt to be harmful to the interests of the Armenian Catholic community in Jerusalem.

To begin with, the Armenian Catholic Church of Our Lady of the Fright at the fifth station of the Via Dolorosa is not Italian in style. The mosaics in the crypt were unearthed before 1885 and the crypt itself has been reconditioned some five years ago.

There is a Titular Bishop as Patriarchal Vicar residing there with three priests. They maintain a school with 110 pupils. They are self-supporting and experience much hardship in these days, owing to the conditions prevailing in the country.

About the Liturgy, the vestments and order of the Armenian Catholic clergy reference may be made to a very useful book by Attwater, *The Uniate Churches*, Wisconsin, 1937. Janin's book in French and Silbernagl's work in German are equally useful.

The holy water stoup and the statue of St. Anthony of Padua are now part and parcel of the ecclesiastical inventory of many Catholic Oriental churches in the Near East, even as far afield as Mardin in Turkey.

As to the pictures of the Way of the Cross, these are hand painted. They are not better nor worse than those one encounters in richly endowed churches. To be sure, they are quite acceptable from the artistic point of view. "A British Resident" is in the happy position to find an opportunity to lift the artistic standard of these pictures by supplying better ones instead.

There is no need to argue the point about the altar. Uniate churches in the East have their altars (especially those of the Greeks) in a similar position. Other parallels could be quoted.

It is evident from the description, that "A British Resident" was present at the first Liturgy, which, as usual, is less fully attended than the main one. The Liturgy as a whole is distinctly Gregorian, with those emendations and modifications allowed to Catholics by the Mother Church. However, the man supposed to have been a "Sunday School Teacher" was one of the School staff.

It is a matter for deep regret that "A British Resident" did not like the first Liturgy. Had he attended the second one (celebrated half an hour later) he would have changed his idea. He would have been compensated by the beautiful, unforgettable tunes chanted by a well trained choir.

"A British Resident" is too idealistic, without making due allowances to the poverty of the congregation, aggravated by the present prevailing unsettled conditions. His unfavourable comment could have been alleviated on second thoughts, if the state of affairs does call for constructive criticism.

The Armenian community in Jerusalem numbers about 6,200 souls. Of these 4,500 are adherents of the national Gregorian rite, 350 are Armenian Catholics, descendants of those who made common cause with the Crusaders of unholy memory, in spite of heavy odds. 1,200 others have embraced the Latin rite; these are converts who returned to the Church since 1919, mostly pressed by economic conditions. They belong to the spiritual flock of the Franciscan fathers, who do their best to help wherever they can. The rest of the community, numbering some 200 souls or so, are Protestants of various denominations, mostly American.

Now, I happen to know personally that "old, weather-beaten Armenian" with the aquiline nose, who so much impressed "A British Resident" by his martial looks. Unfortunately he is a romantic person, and a sly fox, who easily gained the confidence of the Franciscans. These are, generally speaking, not better judges of oriental characters than the average European. I had a hearty laugh when reading about the ready tears in his eyes. . . . The Armenians converted to the Latin rite depend for their support mostly on the charity of the Franciscans. These do not know the language, but judge by appearance. Much of the religious fervour of the newly converted flock depends to some extent on the regularity of the pecuniary help accorded to them at fixed intervals by the Franciscans. And this in turn is increased or reduced according to the regularity in attending church. Such is the zeal which impressed "A British Resident." *Hinc illae lacrimae.* . . .

The man therefore cannot but give statements to "A British Resident" which are illogical. For coming to the question of confession and spiritual administration, the Franciscans have only one Armenian priest to attend this flock, ever increasing. The rest of the priests do not speak Armenian or Turkish (the languages of these converts) and more often than not very little Arabic. These derogatory remarks on the Catholic clergy of the Armenian rite are out of place and—to say the least—biased. They cannot be

proved ; and therefore cannot be left unobjected to. My personal experience is against it. One cannot praise too highly the self-sacrifice of the Uniate Armenian clergy, who look after their flock in a true Christian spirit. The Franciscan fathers too are also to be thanked for their never failing spiritual and pecuniary help to those destitutes who join their rite. It was the present Titular Bishop who inaugurated the school and did his very best to raise the standard of his community in the face of seemingly insurmountable difficulties.

It may not be out of place to state here that similar answers are readily given to tourists and newcomers from local people. Our people boast of an experience extending over several generations in handling tourists in this way and giving them exactly the answer expected. They are able to adapt their answers to the mentality of the respective inquirer. *Sapiente sat.* . . . And the man supposed to have "come to Jerusalem to end his days in prayer and visiting the Holy Places" is in fact a part time guide.

The Armenians of the Gregorian rite refuse from a national consideration the idea of a union with Rome. But this union does not tend to induce the Catholic Armenians to abandon their language and national customs, as is the case with the acceptance of the so-called Latin rite. Its adherents become Arabs to all intents and purposes, and lose their language after the third generation. But the Armenian Catholics have stood the test of time. They retained their union with Rome and their national language. They cannot make converts on the scale carried out by the Franciscans. For no pecuniary facilities are offered by them to the new converts, as is done by the Franciscans.

It would serve no useful purpose to publish one's first undigested impressions and conversations with unknown people, who represent only their own selves and not a section of the community, and to give their statement authoritative value. Destructive criticism, as felt from "A British Resident's" article, cannot better matters in spite of the undoubted good intention of the writer. Is it in conformity with true Christian doctrines to pass summarily such a severe judgement? Does the article honour its writer, who is a newcomer to the country and cannot have studied the question thoroughly?

Only in close contact and with infinite loving patience full understanding of these naturally intricate questions of the Catholic Churches of Oriental rite may be attained. And understanding means forbearance if not broadmindedness and brotherly love, which "covereth a multitude of sin."

A LOCAL RESIDENT.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

True Humanism. By Jacques Maritain. (Geoffrey Bles. The Centenary Press.) pp. 304. 10s. 6d.

Whatever Maritain writes is well worth reading, but this book, a translation of *Humanisme Intégrale*, is a work that ought to be studied by everyone interested in the trend of the modern world. Such books as these are among the hopeful signs of our time. Here is clear thinking and bold statement; an attempt to apply philosophy to the practical affairs of life. It is an exposition of the principles the Christian must bear in mind when he enters the world of industry or moves in the temporal order of culture and civilization.

Maritain examines the attitude of the medieval world to the problems of man, of grace and freedom, an attitude which he describes as theocentric humanism. The Middle Ages was a period when the Incarnation vitally influenced all the activities of human life. In fact, *Humanisme Intégrale* is the humanism of the Incarnation. Consequent on the Reformation and the Renaissance there developed a new kind of humanism apart from the Incarnation. This is that anthropocentric humanism which sets man in the place of God, and ends in the atheistic humanism of the Soviets.

This new humanism was in part born of resentment through the fault of the Christian world unfaithful to its own principles. For Christians—not Christianity—failed in the temporal task of informing our social institutions with the spirit of the Gospel. Christians had made a pillow of the eternal truths; and there is now an urgent call for a new Christian order which shall work for the rehabilitation of man in God. The Renaissance ideal of the gentleman must give place to the Christian ideal of the saint. We want a new real refraction of the Gospel in the temporal order of social life, which will recognize and restore the offended dignity of all the poor in the world. We want an aristocracy founded upon work and the ability to work. We must have done with the false ideals of the worn-out capitalist system that followed in the wake of the Reformation.

Not that we look for a repetition in the modern world of the social institutions of the Middle Ages. The new Christian world will be a real but new refraction of the Gospel in the world as we know it, a world transformed by the scientific achievements of past centuries; and the new conditions must necessarily materially modify the influence of those principles, eternal and unchanging, active in the temporal order of our day. For the principles are invariable, but their application varies from age to age.

Maritain does not believe in a Christianity to be lived only on paper. The Christian should not absent himself from any field of human action; he is needed everywhere. Nevertheless, though a man toil and spend himself for the betterment of the temporal order of things, the Christian will remember that his religion is "essentially supernatural, and because it is supernatural, it is not a part of man, nor of the world, nor of a race, nor of a culture, nor of a civilization—it belongs to the inner life of God. It transcends all civilization and every culture." In the phrase of Christopher Dawson, it is "beyond politics."

But the reader must turn to the book itself where he will find these and other matters of no less importance treated with force and clarity by a staunch disciple of Aristotle and St. Thomas.

F.A.W.

Contemporary Continental Theology. By Walter Marshall Horton. (Student Christian Movement Press.) pp. 239. 7s. 6d.

We have in the book before us a most valuable and interesting volume. Mr. Horton is an American but, as he remarks in the introduction, there is a kinship between America and Britain when either is confronted with Continental thought.

The book deals with Catholic and Orthodox theologians and Protestant theology both inside and outside of Germany; a very complete picture indeed. Obviously in the limited space at his disposal the author has to make a selection out of the contemporary theologians or out of the representative schools of theological thought. It is in this selection that we think, in the case of both Catholic and Orthodox theological outlook, the picture is not as complete as it should have been.

In treating with both Catholics and Orthodox some excellent introductory paragraphs—*The Catholic "Return from Exile," The Orthodox Renaissance*—give the reader the necessary background.

The two theologians chosen as representative of present-day Catholic theological thought are Jacques Maritain and Father Erich Przywara, S.J., which, apart from contrasting the two men themselves, is intended as a contrast between the outlook of Paris and Munich, and to give a complete picture of Catholic thought. As far as it goes we think it is true and great service has been rendered to the enquirer, but we should have liked the Liturgical and Neo-Patristic Movements to have had equal attention.

In the same way the choice of the representatives of Orthodoxy is confined to Nicholas Berdyaev and Father Sergius Bulgakov. Certainly no review of Orthodox theological thought would be complete without much space being devoted to the writings of these Russians, but they do not represent the whole of contemporary Orthodox theological thought. Athens as well as Paris should have been mentioned and in treating of Paris more space should have been given to Father George Florovsky.

In the treatment of Protestant theology the author is more at home and he has done his work very thoroughly. Perhaps some space should have been given to Professor F. Heiler.

Karl Barth is naturally considered very fully, both in his influence in as well as out of Germany. The consideration of the extreme "Aryanism"—Rosenberg, Hauer and Hisch—is of great interest.

Among the Scandinavian theologians, Bishop Aulen's reopening of the problem of Atonement is of first class importance. Much else of outstanding interest could be mentioned.

The book is almost essential for any English-speaking student who desires an introduction to Continental theology. There is an excellent bibliography.

B.W.

Am Weissen Meere. By Alexandra Anzerowa. (Published by Ferdinand Schöningh; Paderborn). 364 pp.

Books on Soviet Russia will always find many interested readers anxious to satisfy themselves as to what is really happening in that vast unknown land. Yet few writers of such books will have had the first-hand experiences of the country which Alexandra Anzerowa gained during her ten years of detention in the hands of the Soviet. She has lived, so she tells us, in a concentration camp on Solowetzki Island in the White Sea; in Archangel; in various little towns and villages on the banks of the great rivers North Dwina, Sukhona and Lusa; in solitary fishing villages on the sea coast; in the dark woods; at the forgotten shrines of believers . . . and from all these she has related her experiences of the people as she knew and loved them, and of their rulers. She gives us no historical information and attempts no general survey; it is just a picture, or rather a long series of tiny pictures of a suffering country people, set out with feminine tact and sympathy and a delicacy of feeling which saves the smallest incidents from becoming commonplace. Essentially they are stories of friendly, simple people over whom hangs constantly the terrible shadow of the OGPU. Altogether

it is a remarkable book, and no reader will put it down unmoved by the thought of the sufferings and cruelties of which he has read.

D.P.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Centenary Press : *Divided Christendom* ; M. J. Congar, O.P.

Sheed & Ward : *A Philosophy of Form* (Second Edition) ; E. I. Watkin.

B. Herder : *The Doctrine of Spiritual Perfection* ; Anselm Stolz, O.S.B.

Prieuré d'Amay-sur-Meuse : *Les Saintes Icones* (2nd Edition) ; Ildefonse Dirks.

Schöningh, Paderborn : *Taufe und Firmung im Byzantinischen Ritus* ; Leo von Rudloff, O.S.B.

L. Breuer, 313, ch. d'Ixelles, Bruxelles : *L'Union des Eglises et Les Persécutions Polonaises en Ukraine*. Par La Federation des Emigrés Ukrainiens.